

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



32101 067675601

PENDLEBURY

PLAIN REPRESENTATION OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION

RECAP

LIBRARY
OF
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Henry Pendlebury

A PLAIN
REPRESENTATION
OF
Transubstantiation,

As it is received in the

Church of Rome:

WITH

The Sandy FOUNDATIONS it is built
upon, and the ARGUMENTS that do
clearly evert and overturn it.

By a Countrey Divine.

Transubstantiation (or the Change of the Substance of Bread and Wine in the Supper of the Lord) cannot be proved by Holy Writ: But it is repugnant to the plain Words of Scripture, overthroweth the Nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many Superstitions. *Articles of the Church of England, Art. 28.*

Nullum hic errori velum, nullus ignorantia pretextus, neque enim vel verbum Dei praeit, vel ratio, vel sensus, & errori ac ignorantia tum demum aliquid datur, ubi obscuritas reperitur sive ex parte objecti, sive ex parte medii, aut modi illud cognoscendi, non vero ubi vitium in subiecto tantum, idque voluntarium ac affectatum. Spanhem. Dub. Evang. Part. 2. Dub. 50. p. 450.—.

London, Printed for J. Johnson, 1687.

(1687)

Wing-P-114

THE PUBLISHER TO THE READER.

IT's an odd Story that some tell us concerning the Ry'd Piper of Halber-
Stade, who being denied the Reward he was promised, for drowning
those Rats wherewith they were much troubled; Turn'd his Pipes a
second Time, and drew all the Children in the Town after him till
he had brought them to a Hill, which opening it self to receive them, pre-
sently closed upon them again. Many of the Romish Communion have
of late been blowing their Pipes in our Streets, and 'tis not much to be
admir'd at, that some Vicious Men of flagitious Lives, and some
Children in Understanding have been tripping and dancing after them,
in the mighty danger, if not in the eternal ruins, of their Souls.

Our Enemies have been busily sowing their Tares, and no doubt had
the good Men but slept, they would have reaped a much larger Harvest.
But the Orthodox and Learned Clergy of our City have stood upon their
Watch, have behav'd themselves faithfully towards God and the Souls of
Men; have so convincingly answered and confuted every Book that hath
crept'd out against our Religion, that if Man can but read and under-
stand, they have sufficient Antidotes against this Poison laid before them.

The Truth of it is, all the Arguments our Adversaries have produced,
are but like the Gibconites old Shoes, only they have new vamp'd them up
again: The same Soldiers that have been so often beaten out of the
Field, only they have new Cloath'd 'em. What Success Dragooning
hath had in our Neighbouring Kingdom, is well known; but certainly by
their arguing their Priests are like a prevail but little among Us. Indeed
'tis an extravagant and most unaccountable thing, that they should under-
take to persuade any to go over to their Communion. For they cannot
offer at this without pretending to give Man some good Reason for so
doing. And yet no Man can forsake our Church, and enter into theirs.

(RC 116)
54566
7055

The PUBLISHER

but he must renounce his Reason in order to it. For what can be more contradictory to the Reason, as well as the Senses of all Mankind, than that monstrous Doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Subject of this following Discourse.

'Tis an Argument indeed that hath been frequently treated upon both formerly and of late, in our own Language as well as in others, to very good Purpose. This Dragon, which some are so zealously setting up again, hath been often beaten down; I hope it will not be thought a needless thing to give it a Few Blows more, utterly to dash the Stump of this Idiot in pieces. That is the end of publishing the following Treatise; the Author whereof I need not tell thee is a Learned Man; the Work it self, if thou peruse it, will prove that. All that I shall say concerning him is this, that his Modesty is proportionable to his Learning, he lives retired far from the Noise of the World; and that he cannot be a greater Stranger to thee, than he is to this present publishing of his Writings on this Subject. The Manuscript was put into my Hands by a Friend of his, and upon the perusal of it, judging it to be an excellent Piece, I was resolved that it should not continue in the same Retiredness and Obscurity as its Author does. And in a time of common Danger, when we are invaded by a formidable Enemy, I see no reason why Books as well as Men should not be pressed and forced into the Field. I thought it also very hard that our learned Clergy here in the City should always be upon Duty, and not be a little relieved by some Forces drawn out of the Country: However I was not willing to go on my own Head, but communicated these Papers to a very learned Person in this City, who encouraged me to pursue my Design by his high Approbation of it.

And indeed tho' so many have batter'd this most absurd Article of the Romish Faith, yet it can hardly be too ill used. 'Tis a Point that hath cost many thousand Lives, and therefore it deserves no Mercy nor Pity, seeing it hath been the occasion of so much Bloodshed and Cruelty. Nay not only have Multitudes suffered a Temporal Death, because they could not swallow this extravagant Doctrine; but Holy Church hath also sentenced them to Eternal Damnation for it. And yet as much pains as they take to cram it down our Throats, and to impose the Belief of it upon us with such severe Methods, and such terrible Threatnings, I am persuaded they would be glad to be fairly rid of it themselves, if they did but know how: (But this Brat they cannot drop, because of their pretence to Infallibility). For there is no one Doctrine of their whole Faith equally absurd and ridiculous with this in the Apprehensions of all Men, none which they are so hard put to to defend; and none that more exposes them to the Scorn and Contempt of the Infidel Nations, as well as that of the

to the READER.

Reformed Churches. The severe Censure of Averroes, related by Cardinal Perron himself on the Credit of Sarga a Jesuit, is well known, that he never found a worse or a more sottish Sect than that of the Christians, who eat the God whom they worship. This is a thing that is matter of great Scandal to the Jews. A thing (as one saith that had reason enough to know) which they can at no hand digest. And Joseph Albon a Spanish Jew, in his Book entituled, Ikkarim, sets forth the many Absurdities of it, and in the close of all saith, they are things as can neither be comprehended by the Mind, nor expressed with the Tongue, nor endured by the Ear; they are contrary to the Understanding and Sense, and consequently cannot be believed, nor have any room among the Articles of Faith.

Nor do the Mahometans come behind the Jews in this matter: of which we have a famous Instance in Monsieur de la Boulaye le Goux in the Account of his Voyages, that the Mahometan Souldiers quarrelling with some of his Retinue, among other reproachful Words, they called them

GODEATERS. And the Truth of it is, 'tis so easy to lay this in the Dish of those that hold this Tenet, that the Silence of all the ancient Enemies of the Christian Religion, Celsus, Porphyry, Lucian &c. who never upbraided the Christians with it, is a plain Demonstration that Transubstantiation was not believed by any in their days. And therefore Rigaltius is astonish'd at it: (and well he might) that among so many Villanies, and so many Injuries, with which the Christians were loaded, even so far as to accuse them of Impiety, under this pretence that they had no Altars, and offered no Sacrifices; and among so many Apostacies of those that revolted from their Religion, there was not any one Man that accused them of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of their God.

And indeed 'tis impossible but that those sharp Wits, that did so industriously carp at any thing that seemed strange and odd to them in the Christian Religion, and the Professors of it, and either invented or spread most malicious Calumnies against them; I say 'tis impossible but that they should have flung this in their Teeth, if any such thing had been believed by them. For this is a more extravagant Folly than any with which the Fathers did, or could upbraid the most sottish among all the Heathens. Can you think any Man to be so mad, said Cicero, as to believe that which he eats to be God? No, the very Egyptians themselves, tho the grossest of Idolaters in ancient Times, were not so destitute of all Sense or Reason. They were so sottish indeed as to worship Sheep, Oxen, yea and Onions; but we never read that they did eat those things they adored. This is a singular thing peculiar to those that style themselves Roman Catholics.

Perr. de l'Euch. l. 3. c. 29.
Sr. Ed. Sands Europe Specul. p. 230. Edit. 1629.
Orat. 3. c. 25. p. 18, 19. cited by Daille against Adam and Cestib. p. 1. p. 116.

pt. 1. c. 100
p. 21.

Rigalt. Not. ad Tertull. l. 2. ad uxor. p. 189.
Not. 7.

De Nat. Deorum l. 3.

And

The PUBLISHER

Gage's Survey
of West Indies,
the two last Pa-
ges.

And as this Doctrine is matter of Sport to those that are without, 'tis of no small Torture and Vexation to them that are within the Roman Church. It not only hinders Men from entering into their Communion, but shakes and Ragers many that from their very Infancy have been trained up in it, notwithstanding the mighty Prejudices of their Education. This was a means of opening the Eyes of our Contry-man Gage, who was formerly a Popish Priest. The Story, as he himself hath told it, in the First Edition of his Survey of the West-Indies (for 'tis left out in the Second) is to this Purpose. Being at a certain time Officiating at the Altar, he chanced to espy a bold and profane Mouse, that it seems had fallied out and seized on the little God Almighty, which he carried off before his Face; for he ran away with this Saviour of theirs in his Mouth, as once their pretended St. Christopher lugged him on his Back. The sight of this made him very thoughtful, and uneasy to his Mind; and indeed well he might, to think he had worship'd a God that was not strong enough to secure himself from a little Mouse. In short, hereupon he began to question the Truth of that Faith he had been trained up in, and so long professed, and could have no Peace in his own Mind till he had renounced Popery, and embraced the Protestant Religion. And I am perswaded there are not a few, who tho' they do not come over to us as he did, but still continue in the external Communion of the Roman Church, yet in their Hearts they do not, and for their Lives they cannot believe Transubstantiation. I know indeed 'tis hard to determine what Extravagancies, both in Opinion and Practice, Men may proceed to, that are once abandon'd and given up by God to believe strong Delusions. When God hath blinded Men, they swallow not only Flies but Camels too. And Education and Temporal Advantages have a mighty influence on Men's Understandings. And therefore I doubt not but many Papists do really believe this Doctrine. Yet however many in that Communion, tho' they think hard, can't choose but see the Nakedness of it so as to be ashamed. Alas! Author not only asserts, but proves that Cardinal Perron himself, a little before his Death, freely confessed to some of his Friends, That he thought the Doctrine to be MONSTROUS; that he had done his endeavour to COLOUR it OVER the best he could in his Books, but that in short he had undertaken an ILL CAUSE, and which was not TO BE MAINTAINED.

Answer to
Walker's Ado-
ration of the
Euch. Pref.
p. 11.

Page 25.

Remarkable also is the Story which the same Author tells us, That the Learned Arch-Bishop Usher, having been so happy as to convert several Roman Priests from their Errours; and enquiring diligently of them, what they who said Mass every Day, and were not obliged to confess Venial Sins, could have to trouble their Confessors so continually withal?

to the READER.

ingenuously acknowledged to him, that the chiefest part of their constant Confession was their Infidelity as to the Point of Transubstantiation, and for which, as was most fit, they mutually quitted and absolved one another.

To this I shall add one thing more, which I do not find that any one of late hath taken notice of; and 'tis one of the same Reverend and most Learned Arch-Bishop Usher, in his Sermon Preached before the King's Majesty, Anno 1624. of the Ununiversality of the Church of Christ, and lately Re-printed at the end of his Answer to the Jesuits Challenge. In that Sermon saith he, I can testify that when I have dealt with some of the Common People, that would be accounted Members of the Roman Church, and demanded of them what they thought of that which I knew to be the common Tenet of their Doctors in this Point; they not only REJECTED IT WITH INDIGNATION, but wonder'd also that I should imagine any of their side to be so FOOLISH as to give Credit to such a SENSELESS THING.

But yet tho there are so many Infidels among them, Multitude being a Note of the true Church, it seems they are resolved that they will not want for Company: and therefore they would persuade us that the Brutes themselves are many of them turned good Roman Catholicks. Of this we have a good Account in a small Book, entituled the School of the Eucharist, a Book not printed a long time since in a dark and ignorant Age, but so lately as the Year 1672, and newly translated into English, wherein are contained many marvellous Stories of the mighty Devotions of Beasts, Birds, Insects, Bees, Spiders, Horses, Dogs, Asses, &c. towards the holy Sacrament of the Altar. Several famous Philosophers indeed have thought that Reason was not peculiar to Men, but that the Brutes have had a competent share of it: And therefore they have maintained that 'twas Religion that made the Difference between us and them, of which they never perceived the least Footsteps in them. But if these rare Stories may be believed, that Opinion of theirs is utterly overthrown. And the Truth of it is, I could heartily wish that the Popish Missionaries would give over their Attempts on us, and lay out their pains on the Conversion of these Creatures, and endeavour to propagate their Faith among them. An Employment which they need not disdain, seeing so many of their Betters have submitted to it. St. Anthony among others, preaching to little or no purpose to some stubborn Hereticks, that would not receive his Message, turns away from them, and by Divine Inspiration goes to the Sea-side, and calls to the Fishes, Ye Fish of the Sea and River, hear the Word of the Lord, since the Hereticks despise it. And 'twas a very serious Sermon that he preached to them; and to very good Pur-

Page 19.

Specul. Exam.
Dist. 7. Ex. 34.

The Publisher to the Reader.

pose, for some of these Fishes his Auditors open'd their Mouths and spoke, and the rest of them bowed their Heads. *Indeed such Creatures as these are the only ones for them to exercise their Talent upon. For 'tis hardly to be conceived that they should have any reasonable Grounds to hope they shall ever make Rational Creatures Profelytes to such a Bundle of Nonsensical Doctrines as their Chureh hath embraced; and among the rest this of Transubstantiation, which contains many Monsters in the Belly of it, which is ript up, and they sufficiently exposed to the Reader's view in the following Discourse. Wherein if any Critical Eye should chance to espye some small Mistakes (tho I do not know of any in it) yet it being published without the Author's Consent, 'tis possible a few have crept in, I hope the Reader will easily pardon such Venial Faults; and kindly entertain this Stranger that comes out of the Country, and appears publicly on no other Design but that of promoting the Common Good.*

•M A T T H. •

MATT. XXVI. 26.

This is my Body.

THE Church of *Rome* hath brought in the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and made it an Article of the Christian Faith, that all Persons in her Communion are required to give their Assent unto, and receive as necessary to Salvation. Yea it is an Article of the Romish Faith that they are most hot in, and have now for some Centuries contended for with Fire and Sword, to the disturbing of the Peace of Christendom, and shedding of Rivers of Christian Blood; Anathematizing, Cursing, Damning, and (where their Arms are long enough) Murthering and Butchering all, without difference, that refuse to give their Assent unto it. And the owning of it (together with the Sacrifice of the Mass, that is bottomed on it, and riseth out of it) is the Mark of the Papal Religion, and the great *σημειον*, or *σημειον*, i. e. Mark or Note of Distinction betwixt a Papist and a Protestant. And therefore this was the particular and main Point, that most of our Blessed Martyrs, in the Days of Queen *Mary*, were first called to answer unto, and declare their Judgment about, and then burned at Stakes all over the Nation, for denying of it, and bearing witness against it. And I wish, that if ever the Romanists gain another like Opportunity, they do not take the same Measures, proceed in the same Method, and make use of their old Argument, *Fire and Faggot*, against whosoever shall not admit and embrace this Doctrine. It is therefore the great Concern of all Protestants, who would not make Shipwreck of their Faith, when it comes to a Fiery Tryal, to make it their Business, to have their Minds rightly informed, and Judgments established in this Matter, that so they may stand fast in the Faith.

Now these Words of our Saviour, are the Foundation upon which they would build this monstrous Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. Of which they say,

1. That before the Act of Consecration, the Elements are true and proper Bread and Wine.

2. That after the Consecration there remaineth no Substance of Bread, or Wine, or any other Substance, but the Substance of Christ, God and

B

Man:

A Plain Representation

Man: Or the very Flesh and Blood of Christ, as he was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and did hang upon the Cross. The Substance of the Bread (by the Strength and Efficacy of Christ's mighty Word, spoken by the Priest) being converted into the Natural Body, and the Substance of the Wine into the Natural Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, under the Terms of Bread and Wine.

3. This Transmutation, Conversion, or turning of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, is that which they call *Transubstantiation*.

4. This *Transubstantiation* is made by the Priest pronouncing (with an intention to consecrate) these five Words over the Bread, *viz. Hoc est enim Corpus meum*, For this is my Body: Hereby this strange Change is made, yet so, as the most Learned of them are not agreed among themselves about the Manner of it; that is, whether the Substance of the Bread be turned into the Substance of Christ's Body *productivè*, so as the Body of Christ is made *ex material panis*, as one thing is made of another; or whether it be *additivè*, by a Recession of the Substance of the Bread, and an Addition or Succession of the Body of Christ into the room of it, as one thing succeeds in the place of another, the first being voided. *Thomas* is for the former, *par. 3. p. 75. Art. 3.* and *Suarez* and *Bellarmino* are for this latter: which indeed is no Transubstantiation, but a meer Succession. But leaving them to wrangle this out among themselves, (tho I believe it is a Matter wherein they will never accord together) we shall proceed to take a view of this new and amusing, or amazing Paradox.

Now that Transubstantiation is a most prodigious and monstrous Opinion, or Fiction, will be very evident from these Three Particulars.

- I. The Original and Rise of it.
- II. The Nature or Constitution of it.
- III. The Products, Consequences, and Fruits of it.

I. Consider the Original and Rise of Transubstantiation, from what Root or Fountain it is derived. And if Enquiry be made after the Birth and first appearing of it in the World, it will appear that this monstrous Opinion crept in, and came up by degrees in an Age of universal Darkness and Debauchery, wherein an easy Entrance and Admittance was given not onely to this, but also unto a Deluge of many other corrupt Doctrines and Practices. It is confessed by all that the 9th, 10th, and 11th Centuries were overspread with Ignorance and Profaneness, inasmuch that *Baronius*, *Platina*, *Gesebrand*, *Bellarmino* and other approved:

proved Writers of the Romish Church (Men we may be sure that would not say the worst) make very sad Exclamations and Complaints. *Baronius* (*ad An. 900*) hath these Words, " In the nine hundredth year " of Christ, the third Indiction, a new Age begins, which by reason of " its Asperity and Barrenness of Good, is wont to be called *the Iron* " *Age* ; from the Deformity of abounding Wickedness, *the Leadens* ; " and from the Scarcity of Writers, *the obscure Age*. And (*ad An. 974*) he saith, That the whole World was overpread with Dark- " nels, as thick as that in *Egypt* ; and again (*ad An. 992*) that at " that time (as it was reported) there were scarce any Learned Men at " *Rome*. And abundance more to the same Purpose. *Platina* calls " the Popes of those days *monstra & portenta hominum*. *Genebrard* " (*in Chron. of the 9th Century*) calls it the unhappy Age, being " barren of ingenions and learned Men : and complains that the Popes " were altogether fallen from the Vertue of their Predecessours, and " were rather Apostates than Apostles. *Bellarmino* cries out, *vide Se-* " *culum infelix !* Behold the unhappy Age, in which were not to be " found any famous Writers, or Councils. Pope *Sergius* was a Slave " to all Vices, and a most wicked Man. *Baronius ad An. 908*. Se- " verall succeeding Popes were of the Breed of this *Sergius*, and his fa- " mous Strumpet *Murcia*, who had a great Hand in making and un- " making of Popes. *John* the 13th, one of *Murcia's* Brats, made " Deacons in his Stable among his Horses, and Boys Bishops, drank a " Health to the Devil, and was given to Sacriledge, Perjury and Adul- " tery ; as *Baleus*, from *Sylvester* the 2d, *An. 999*, to *Hildebrand* or " *Gregory* the 7th inclusively (*An. 1075.*) The Popes (says *Benno*) " were all Negromancers. This *Gregory* (or *Lurva Diaboli*, as *Luther* " stiled him) poysoned 6 or 7 Popes before he could obtain the Chair ; " he threw the Sacrament into the Fire ; and was at last deposed for " his intolerable Excesses. It were easy to prosecute this to a great " Length, and produce Multitudes of Instances out of their own Authors, " of the lamentable Ignorance and Wickedness both of Clergy and Lal- " ty in those Ages. Now in this time when Darknels and Profaneness were " grown over the Face of the Church, and Church-men minded nothing " but the Advancement of their Lusts and secular Interests, this deformed " and mishapen Monster first appeared. And Disputes arose about the re- " al Presence, which some began then to assert, but were opposed by *Be-* " *ram*, *Erigena*, *Rabanus*, and others in the 9th Century, and by *Be-* " *ringarius* in the 11th. About the year 1170, *Lombard* began to as- " sert that the Substance of the Bread was turned into the Body, and the " Substance of the Wine into the Blood of Christ. *Sent. L. 4. dist. 10.*

A Plain Representation;

Lit. D. yet *Distinct*. 11 *Lit. A.* He confesseth, that he was not able to define the Manner of it: But having reckon'd up several Opinions, he concludes, that there is no Substance left but the Body and Blood of Christ; and therefore, *Distinct*. 12. *Lit. A.* determines that the Accidents of the Bread and Wine exist *sine Subjeto*. After *Lombard* this Subject became the great Apple of Contention among the School-Men, who ventilated it to and fro by many Disputations, whereby it was kept alive, till at last in the fourth Council of *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the 3^d, *An.* 1215. It was established as a Decree of the Sacred Council, and Point of Faith, That the Body and Blood of Christ were truly contained under the kinds of Bread and Wine, the Bread being transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of Christ. This Decree the Council of *Trent*, *Sess.* 13. *Can.* 2 hath confirmed with an *Anathema*, thundered out against all that deny Transubstantiation.

And thus this Monster was brought forth, and came out in the Midnight of the Church, when (upon the Matter) all Men were fast asleep.

II. The monstrousness of this Opinion will appear from the Consideration of the Constitution and Nature of Transubstantiation. Look upon it in this respect, and it will be found to be the most prodigious Monster that ever was brought forth. A Monster that is constituted and compounded of many.

1. Gross and inextricable Absurdities.
2. Manifest Impossibilities and Contradictions.
3. Open and abominable Impieties.
4. Horrible Blasphemies.

There is such a *Collocies, Clacca*, or Sink of all these meeting in Transubstantiation, as never met together in any of the most absurd Opinions that the Pagan World hath been given up unto.

First, It is compounded of many gross Absurdities. Absurdities against Sense, Reason, Faith, Scripture.

1. It goes against Sense. Sense when duly disposed, or rightly circumstantiated (that is, when the Organ is sound and right, the Medium or Mean fitly qualified, and the Object duly proportionated) is a competent Judge of things that are the proper Objects of Sense. *St. Luke* therefore brings this as the great Evidence and Proof of the Truth and Certainty of those things which he communicated by Writing, unto the

of Transubstantiation.

5

World, concerning our Saviour's Person, Doctrine and Miracles, *Luke* 1. 1, 2, 3. And *St. John* useth the same Argument, 1 *Joh.* 1. 2, 3. Yea our Lord Jesus Christ himself, when he would convince the Apostles (who thought he had been a Spirit, at his appearing to them after his Resurrection) that it was he himself, sends them for Conviction and Satisfaction to their own Senses, *Luk.* 24. 36, 37, 38, 39, 40. *Behold my Hands and my Feet, that it is I my self: handle me, and see, for a Spirit hath not Flesh and Bones, as ye see me have.* And *Joh.* 20. 27. he useth the same Argument to doubting *Thomas.* *Reach hither thy Finger, and behold my Hands; and reach hither thy Hand, and thrust it into my Side, and be not faithless, but believing.* Thus Sense is a competent Judge of matters of Sense. But now if we receive Transubstantiation, we must renounce and go against, or clean cross to all our Senses. For if we make our Senses (when best disposed) Judges in this Case, and bring a Popish Host, or Wafer to this Bar, they will all, with one accord, conclude that it is Bread, and not Flesh; Bread and nothing else. The Eye, the Touch, the Taste, the Smell will all agree in this. Yea if *Indians*, or *Americans* (who are perfectly unconcerned in these Matters, and know nothing of our Differences) be called in to give their Vote in this Controversy, they will without all Controversy forthwith determine against Transubstantiation: For it is plainly contrary to the common Sense of all Mankind. He must have something more than his five Wits about him, nay go quite out of all his Senses, that finds another Substance and Body, than that of Bread, in a consecrated Wafer. If it be said, But our Senses may be deceived, and represent things to us otherwise than they are. I say, true, it may be so, when there is some indisposition of the Organ, or Medium, or Object. But then if Transubstantiation be true, and there be a deception in this Case, it must be granted that the Senses of all Men are deceived; and that the Senses of all Men are deceived not for once, or at some times, but constantly Day after Day, and Year after Year. And that they are thus deceived when, and while they are in every respect best disposed and fitted for performance of their proper Acts. And further, that they are deceived after this manner, about a most sensible Object, and in a manner wherein it is as hard to think how they should be thus universally deceived, as in any one thing whatsoever, that is, the Object of Sense. And now if this be once granted, it takes away and quite overthrows all certainty of Sense, and consequently all certainty of Faith and Belief in the main Points of Religion; as of our Saviour's Person, Doctrine, Miracles, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension: And so undermines the very Foundation, and shakes the chief Pillars of Christianity.

2. It is against Reason. Reason goes beyond Sense, but this Transubstantiation goes beyond Reason; and not only beyond Reason, but against Reason: And is contrary to the broadest Light of Reason. For Transubstantiation,

Non potest unum corpus esse localiter in duobus locis, quia ita idem a seipso divideretur. Thom. part. 4. dist. 44. q. 2. Art. 2.

(1.) Makes the Body of Christ to be in Heaven, on the Earth, and in Millions of places of the Earth at one and the self-same Time. Now this is against Reason. Reason dictates this, that all corporal Substances or Bodies, are *in loco circumscriptive* circumscribed in a certain Place, and cannot be in more than one, at one time. It is wholly inconsistent with Reason to say, that the same Man is at *London* and at *Rome*, sitting in his House and walking in his Fields, at the same time: And is it not as absurd to say, that the Body of Christ is locally in Heaven, and yet at the same time really, substantially and locally in a thousand thousand different and distinct places of the Earth?

(2.) Gives a nutritive virtue unto meer Accidents. That the Elements received in the Sacrament do nourish the Bodies of the Communicants, cannot be denied. Now according to their Doctrine, there remains no Substance of Bread and Wine, but the Accidents only, as length, breadth, thickness, whiteness, redness: And therefore it must be these that refresh and nourish. But what can be more absurd and irrational than such a Fancy? Can a Body receive nourishment from Length, and Colour, and other bare Accidents? This is above Reason. Yet if Transubstantiation be true, this (whatever Reason may suggest to the contrary) is most true. The Monk *Amonius* (*lib. 5. de gestis Franc. cap. 29.*) reports that *Ludovicus Pius* received nothing but the Eucharist for 40 Days together. And other Authors among them have reported, that they have had some Holy Men who would feed upon nothing but the Eucharist; and so (according to their Opinion) lived on meer Accidents: And thus all the Romanists may live on bare Accidents. For (as *Tolet de instrum. Sacerd. l. 2. c. 25.*) a Priest may transubstantiate at once a whole Pantrey of Bread, and a whole Cellar of Wine.

(3.) Sets up the Accidents of Bread, as Colour, Figure, Smell, Taste, without any Subject or Body in which they subsist. They affirm that the Substance of the Bread and Wine is totally avoided, yet confess that the Accidents of the Bread and Wine remain, such as Whiteness, Redness, Moisture. Now where, or in what Subject do these Accidents subsist? In the Elements: This cannot be, for the Elements are quite annihilated, or voided at least. Do they exist in the Body of Christ? By no means, this they all deny: Where then? Why, certainly nowhere. Here is color, & nihil coloratum, sapor, & nihil saporatum, quantitas, & nihil quantum, qualitas, & nihil quale. Whiteness,

ness, and nothing white, Savour, and nothing that favoureth, Length, and nothing long, Breadth, and nothing broad. Now this is such Divinity as crosses Reason, and offers violence to Nature. For *accidens est ens in alio. Accedentis esse, est in esse, i. e. esse in subjecto.* The very Being of an Accident consisteth in its existing in a Substance or Subject; and it can be no longer than its Subject is in being.

(4.) Makes that which is plain Bread to be no Bread. This again puts Reason to a Nonplus, to conceive how a Wafer, that hath the form of Bread, the quantity of Bread, the whiteness of Bread, the smell of Bread, and the taste of Bread, should yet be no Bread; but very Flesh, and a whole Human Body. This amuseth Reason, and is so contrary to it, that every Christian who will but make use of his Reason must say, as *Thomas Spurdance* the Martyr, when the Chancellor of *Norwich* asked him, *Do'st thou not believe that after the Words of Consecration in the Sacrament of the Altar, there is the same Body of Christ as was born of the Virgin Mary?* No, said *Spurdance*, for that Body consisted of Flesh, Blood, and Bones; and here is no such thing.

Thus Transubstantiation is against Reason, and brings in such things to be received, as no Man can receive without doing open violence to his Reason.

3. It is against Faith. As Reason goes beyond Sense, so Faith goes beyond Reason, and sees farther than Reason can reach when most elevated. But Transubstantiation outgoes them all, Sense cannot reach it, Reason cannot overtake it, Faith cannot fathom it. It imposes things upon the Belief of Men, that are not only very hard to be believed, but things that are wholly incredible, past Credit or Belief. It is altogether incredible.

(1.) That a Priest can make a Body that was made and existent long before he himself had any Being. Can make the Body of Christ now in a Wafer, which was made more than sixteen hundred Years agoe in the Womb of the Virgin. Can a Father beget a Son that is already begotten and born? Can a Man that was born at *London* 40, 50, or 60, Years since, be born to Day or to Morrow at *Lancaster*? Who can believe this? For as one says, *factum facere, & factum intactum facere*, are equally both incredible and impossible.

(2.) That our Saviour had two Bodies, two contrary Bodies, and both these at one and the same Time. Is not this incredible? Yet who-soever will believe Transubstantiation, must believe this. Believe that when he instituted, and celebrated his last Supper with the Disciples he had two Bodies.

A Plain Representation

1. One speaking, moving, acting in blessing, breaking, and giving the Bread ; another without motion or action.

2. One visible and palpable, another altogether invisible, and hidden under the forms of Bread and Wine.

3. One mortal, weak, and ready to be crucified, another impassible, and obnoxious to no Suffering.

4. One sitting at the Table among the Disciples, another at the same time in the Mouths and Stomachs of the Disciples.

5. One Body breaking another Body, and dividing it among them ; or rather one giving another whole and entire Body to every one of them. Are not all these hard things ? Is it not past Belief, that Christ, whole Christ, should be eaten by every one of them, and yet sit among them ? That he should at the same instant sit whole at the Table, and be in each of their Stomachs, and whole in every one of them, whole in *Peter*, whole in *John*, whole in *James*, and so in the rest ? What may they not believe that can believe these things ? Verily he must first resolve to believe any thing, things past belief, who resolves to be a Papist.

4. It is against Scripture, as well as Sense, Reason, and Faith. The Word of God (*πάντων ἀντάξιον ἄλλων*) is clearly against it, and affirms the Elements to be Bread and Wine both before and after the Consecration. In the Institution it is expressly said, that *Jesus took Bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my Body*; *Mat. 26. 26.* Here that which he took was Bread, that which he blessed was Bread, that which he brake was Bread, that which he gave was Bread, and that he spake of when he said, *This is my Body*, was Bread ; for by this he meant that which he then held in his Hands, and when he spake these Words, he held nothing but Bread in his Hands. And therefore by this he meant that Bread, and consequently by *This is my Body*, he meant this Bread is my Body ; that is, a Sign of my Body. So also in the Institution of the Cup, that which he calls his Blood, *v. 28.* he calls the *Fruit of the Vine*, *v. 29.* Plainly declaring that it was not his proper Blood, but Wine, as a Sign of his Blood, that he gave. The Apostle *Paul* repeating the Institution, as he had received it of the Lord, calleth it Bread four times over, *1 Cor. 11. 23, 26, 27, 28.* and *1 Cor. 10. 16.* *The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ ?* and *v. 17.* *We are all partakers of that one Bread.* So *Acts 2. 46.* *The Disciples brake Bread from House to House.* And *Acts 20. 7.* *The Disciples came together to break Bread.* Now this, as themselves confess, is meant of the Eucharist.

Moreover, that Transubstantiation is repugnant to the Scripture, is plain : for if it were admitted, then it would follow, either, 1. That

Christ

Christ is not ascended to Heaven. Or, 2. That he descendeth daily from Heaven. Now both these are contrary to express Articles of the Christian Faith, and plain Testimony of the Scripture.

(1.) If we say, he ascended not; It is contrary to *Mark* 16. 19. *Luke* 24. 51. *Acts* 1. 9, 10. *Acts* 2. 33. *Eph.* 4. 8, 9, 10. *Col.* 3. 1. *1 Tim.* 3. 16. *Heb.* 4. 14. *Heb.* 8. 1. *Heb.* 9. 24. &c. And to his own express Declaration, *John* 16. 28. *I leave the World, and go to the Father.*

(2.) If we say, that he descendeth daily from Heaven; it is no less repugnant to the Testimony of the Angels, *Acts* 1. 10, 11. *This same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen him go into Heaven, i. e.* clearly, visibly, gloriously, as *Mat.* 24. 30. and 25. 31. *1 Thess.* 4. 16. And to the Testimony of the Apostle *Peter*, *Acts* 3. 19, 20, 21. and of our Saviour himself, *Mat.* 26. 11. *Joh.* 12. 8. *Me ye have not always.* Upon which Words, *Augustin* (*Tract. in Joan.* 50.) hath these Words, "He speaketh of his Corporal Presence. "For in respect of his Majesty, Providence, ineffable and "invisible Grace, that which he said is fulfilled. *Lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the World.* But "according to the Flesh which was assumed by the Word, "according to that which was born of the Virgin, according to that which was apprehended by the Jews, which "was Crucified, which was taken down from the Cross, "which was wrapped in Linen, which was laid in the "Sepulchre, which was shewed in the Resurrection: *Ye have not me alway with you.* When *Jeffrey Hurst* of *Shakerley*, in *Lancashire*, was brought before Justice *Leland*, he caused a Mass to be Sung, and bad *Jeffrey* first go and see his Maker, and then he would talk with him. *Jeffrey* answered, *Sir, my Maker is in Heaven.* Christians, the Body of Christ is in Heaven, Transubstantiation, in contradiction to the Scripture, places it in the Earth.

This is the first; Transubstantiation is made up of many Absurdities, against Sense, Reason, Faith, and Scripture.

Secondly, It is compounded of many manifest Impossibilities and Contradictions. Transubstantiation is an impossible Paradox. It is impossible that there should be any such thing.

1. It is impossible that one and the same Body should *simul & semel* all at once, or at one time be both visible and invisible, divisible and in-

Loquitur de presentia corporis. Nam secundum Majestatem suam, secundum Providentiam, secundum ineffabilem & invisibilem Gratiā, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, Ecce, ego vobiscum sum usq; ad consummationem seculi. Secundum carnem vero quam verbum assumpsit, secundum quod de virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judæis comprehensus est, quod ligno crucifixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod Lintheis involutus, quod in Sepulchro conditus, quod in Resurrectione manifestatus: non semper habebitis me vobiscum.

A Plain Representation

divisible, one and many, in Heaven and upon the Earth, all here and all in a thousand other places. All these are plain Impossibles; yee Transubstantiation carries them all in its Womb.

2. It is impossible that Christ should eat Himself, his own Body. Now the Papists confess that he ate and drank with the Disciples in the Sacraments, whence it necessarily followeth, granting Transubstantiation, that Christ did eat Himself, and was all at once whole at the Table, whole in his own Hands, whole in his own Mouth; whole within Himself, whole without Himself, devoured by Himself and untouched. All these are apparent Contradictions, and of such a nature, as nothing can be said that is more monstrous, or liker to expose Christianity to more open Obliquy and Reproach. Yet I say, by this Doctrine Christ ate Himself, sat at the Table, and was in his own Mouth, and in his own Stomach. Oh Prodigious! The Body of Christ was in the Body of Christ. Others have told us of Men-eaters, but never any but Papists of any Self-eaters, who at once eat his whole Self.

3. It is impossible that the Body of Christ should be eaten over-night by the Disciples, and yet be crucified the next Day. What! Could it be both eaten, and not eaten? It brings to mind the Story of *Alice Driver* (*Acts and Mon.* Vol. 3. p. 887.) She conferring with Dr. *Gascoign*, asked him, *whether it was Christ's Body that the Disciples did eat over-night?* He answered, *Yea.* *What Body was it then* (said she) *that was Crucified the next Day?* He replied, *Christ's Body.* *How could that be* (said she) *when his Disciples had eaten him over night? Except he had two Bodies, as by your Argument he had, one they did eat over-night, and another was Crucified the next Day.* Such a Doctor, such Doctrine. This put her Examiners to that Shame, that one looked on another, and had not another Word to speak.

Thirdly, It is compounded of many abominable Impieties, even such as deserve to be had in utter Detestation and Abomination among all them that name the Name of Christ. It is execrable Impiety to say,

1. That the Son of God, and Saviour of Man, and the Devil, both entered into *Judas* together.

2. That the Body and Blood of Christ may kill and destroy the Bodies of Men. Yet this supposed, *viz.* that Transubstantiation is true, it may be, yea hath been so: the Emperor *Henry* the 7th, was poysoned in the Host, and Pope *Nicholas* the 3d. was poysoned in the Chalice. Now they must grant that the Poyson which killed them, was either, 1. In the Elements, or in the bare Accidents, or in the Body and Blood of Christ. The first they must flatly deny, if they will be constant to their

their own Hypothesis; the second is grossly absurd; and therefore they must grant the third, and that is horribly impious.

3. It is execrable Impiety to say, that the Body of Christ, 1. May be inclosed in a Wafer. 2. May be devoured and eaten by wicked Men, 3. May be gnawed and torn with the Teeth of Men. 4. May be mangled and cut in pieces with Swords or Knives. 5. May be eaten by Mice and Rats, and other Vermin. 6. May grow mouldy and rot away, 7. May breed Worms and Maggots. 8. May be stolen, as *Laban's Gods*, *Gen. 31. 30.* and never found again. 9. May be thrown into the Mire, and trodden under the Feet of Men and Beasts. 10. May be cast out into the Draught or Jakes. 11. May be swept to the stinking Dunghil. All these are horrible to be once named, yet, granting Transubstantiation, they may be done, are done, and many of them cannot but be done almost every Day. If Transubstantiation be true, then the Body of Christ is inclosed in a Wafer, eaten by wicked Men, may be torn with Teeth, mangled with Swords, gnawed by Vermin &c. *Whatsoever entereth in at the Mouth, goeth into the Belly, and is cast out into the Draughts*, *Mat. 15. 17.* I shall shut up this with the Saying of *Margery Baxter*, to one who told her that she believed, that the Sacrament of the Altar, after Consecration was the very Body of Christ in form of Bread. *Margery* answered, *your Belief is naught; for if every such Sacrament were God, and the very Body of Christ, there should be an infinite Number of Gods. Because that a thousand Priests and more, do make a thousand such Gods, and afterward eat them every day, and void them out again by their hinder parts, filthily stinking under the Hedges, where you may find a great many such Gods, if you will seek for them.* *Act. and Mon. 610.*

Fourthly, It is compounded of many horrible Blasphemies. Transubstantiation is a name and thing that is full of Blasphemy. For,

1. It overthrows the Humanity of Christ. Jesus Christ hath not a true human Body, if it want a human Shape, the Figure, Quantity, and essential Properties of a Body. Now a Body that is invisible, impalpable, without Extension or Quantity, Parts or Members scithrated apart in their places, due distance of Parts, just Dimensions, Place or Room taken up by it, wants the Figure and essential Properties of a Body, and is *ἀσώματον αἰώμα*. And such a Body is Christ's Body made by Transubstantiation. It is true, they are not agreed in what manner the Body of Christ is in the Host. Some will have it to be there *desque magnitudine*, without quantity. Others will have it to be there in quantity, but without Figure, Extension, or Distinction of Parts. See

Ezek. 9. 5.

Bellar. de Euchar. l. 3. c. 5. We have a remarkable instance of this, in the diffention betwixt Dr. *Kenall*, and Dr. *Chadsey*, as they were examining one *Thomas Wood*. *Kenall* having asked *Wood* this question, "Dost thou not believe that after the Priest hath spoken these Words, "*This is my Body*, that there remains no more Bread and Wine, but the "very Fleish and Blood of Christ, as he was born of the Virgin, and "did hang upon the Cross? *Wood* answered, I pray you, Master Chancellor, give me leave to ask you another: "When God commanded "*Ezekiel* to shave off his Hair, and to burn a third part in the Fire, "and this, saith he, is *Jerusalem*; I pray you, was it Hair that was "burnt, or *Jerusalem*? *Kenall* answered, It did signify *Jerusalem*. "Even so these Words of Christ are to be understood, said *Wood*. Up- "on this *Chadsey* replied, I will prove that Christ is here present under "the Form of Bread and Wine, but not in quantity and quality. Yes, "saith *Kenall*, he is here present in quantity and quality. *Chadsey* re- "turned, he is here present under a Form, but not in quantity and "quality. And thus the one said *Yes*, the other said *No*: Till the Con- tention grew so hot, that they foamed again, and *Kenall* departed in a great Rage. Whereupon *Wood* said, "Behold, good People, they "would have us to believe that which they do not believe themselves, "nor can agree upon. Yet tho they cannot agree in what Manner the "Body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, they are thus far at one, *viz.* "That the Body of Christ is inclosed in the Wafer, and not only so, but "that the Body of Christ is whole and entire in every Crum and Point "of the Wafer, and Drop of the Wine: And whole and entire, as "many times as there are Crumbs and Drops in the Bread and Wine. Now this must necessarily destroy his Humanity. For a Body in all Points, like unto ours (Sin only excepted), as our Saviour's was. (*Heb* 2. 17.) I say, a Body of such Dimensions cannot be in so small a room as a little thin Wafer, and so often over also, as there are smallest Points in that Wafer: But it must be without Figure, distinct Parts, Extension, &c. A Body without bigness, long without length, broad without breadth, thick without thickness. A Body with two Eyes, two Hands, two Feet, all in one self-same Point.

2. It turneth the Body of Christ into a Monster or misshapen Thing, into the Figure and Form of a round Cake, that hath neither Shape nor any Part of a human Body. If a Woman should bring forth a round Cake of Bread, when she is in Travail, instead of a Manchild of right Shape, all the Countrey would presently ring of it, as a very strange and monstrous Birth: and is it not much more monstrous to hear this of the Body of our blessed Lord? What Christian Ear can endure such Blasphemy?

3. It

3. It investeth Man with a Power to make God, and the Creature with a Power to create his Creator. This every silly and filthy massing Priest pretends to do each day, viz. make Jesus Christ. Hence proceedeth their Manner of speaking. He that created me, hath given me Power to create him; and he that created me without my Help, is created by me. And so of lifting up God, when the Priest lifts up the Host, and going to see their Creator when they go to Mass, and to receive their Creator, when they are to receive at *Easter*, and so also the Priest carries it to the Sick with these Words, *Behold, my Friend, God thy Creator, whom I have brought unto thee.* Thus they ascribe a Power to Man to make God. And *Biel* setteth every Priest, in this respect, above the Blessed Virgin. She conceived and bare Christ but once, but a Priest can make him as often as he will. But let those Wretches go on in their God-making as long as they will, let us say of this bready God, as *Katharine Hut*, Martyr, to *Bonner*, *I deny it to be God, because it is a dumb God, and made with Mens Hands.*

Virgo Maria, & si in gratia plenitudinae creaturas supergrediatur universas, Hierarchis tamen cedit Ecclesiae

in commissi mysterii executione. Illa nempe prolatis octo verbulis, Ecce Ancilla Domini, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum, semel concepit Dei filium & Mundi Redemptorem. Isti a Domino consecrati quinque verbis contextam consecrationis formam, cum debita intentione proferentes eandem Dei Virginisque filium invocant quotidie corporaliter in sacrificium & criminum purgationem. *Biel* *Lib. 4. in Can. Missae.*

4. It carrieth this Blasphemy also in it; that as a Priest can make God, so he can make God of a Piece of Bread; of that, which was but a little before growing in the Field, cut by the Reapers, threshed out with a threshing Instrument, ground in the Mill, kneaded and made by the Baker, and baken in the Oven. *Fis Cibus, ex Pane Caro, Deus ex Elemento.* What can be more monstrous than this? The *Athenians* sentenced *Anaxagoras* to Death, for affirming, that the Sun was nothing else but a fiery Stone: those Idolaters counting it a great Blasphemy, to make their God a Stone: and shall we consent to them, who would make our God a Piece of Bread? I shall say to you, as the holy Martyr, *John Noyes*, to the People, when he was at the Stake, *Good People, they tell you, that they can make a God of a piece of Bread, but believe them not.* When the Chancellor of *Norwich* asked *Cicely Ormes*, what it was that the Priest held up over his Head, she said, *Bread:* and if you would make it any better, it is worse.

I mention the Sayings of our English Martyrs, and I do profess that I mention them with great Content, and esteem them worthy to be graven with an Iron Pen and Lead, in the Rock for ever. Being the Sayings of those (more than Conquerours), who sealed the Truth with their

A Plain Representation

their dearest Blood ; and by it, they being dead, yet speak ; every drop of their Blood preaching this Truth to us, which they sacrificed it in the Defence of, dying not only with invincible Courage and Constancy, but also with an Exuberancy of Joy and Comfort ; professing that if they had a hundred Lives, they should all go in this Cause.

5. Yet it is big with another Blasphemy, which is worse, if there can be a worse. And that is, that Man may eat his Maker, the Creature his Creator, and a People may devour their God. This is their constant Practice, first they lift up the Host, next they adore it as God, and then forthwith eat it up. But *Cicero* could say, *Quem tam amicum esse putas*, who dost thou think is so mad and beside himself, as to believe that to be a God that he eats? Surely it is no less than amazing Madness in any to believe that that they eat, can be a God : but it is something worse than Folly and Madness, for any to eat that which they believe is their God. When *Pharaoh*, King of *Egypt*, gave way that the *Hebrews* should sacrifice to their God in the Land, *Moses* returned this Answer, *It is not meet so to do ; for we shall sacrifice the Abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God ; Lo, shall we sacrifice the Abomination of the Egyptians before their Eyes, and will they not stone us ? Exod. 8. 26.* that is to say, if we should sacrifice those Beasts to the Lord our God before the Eyes of the *Egyptians*, which they do worship, and give Divine Honour unto ; (*animalia quæ abominando culta vobis, & quæ abominantur occidi*) they would be so enraged with this Fact, as they would certainly stone us : Will they not stone us ? doubtless they will. They will never abide to see their Gods sacrificed. But tho the *Egyptians* would not have born this, yet the *Papists* can, yea instead of stoning others, they daily sacrifice their God with their own Hands, eat him when they have done, and sacrifice those in Flames, that will not do as they do.

6. Once more ; it is a Doctrine that puts God into the Power, and makes him subject to the Will and Pleasure of every sorry Priest. Who can, 1. Make God when he will. 2. Carry him whither he will. 3. Keep him where he will, in his Pocket, or Purse, or Trunk, or Chest, or Box, or any where else. 4. Do with him what he will, tread him under foot, cast him to Dogs or Hogs to be devoured by them, throw him into Fire or Water, as *Pope Gregory* the 7th, who cast the Sacrament, or Host, into the Fire, because it answered not his Demands concerning his Success against the Emperour. Yea, he may pawn him for Security of Debts : As *Lewis* the 9th of *France*, who being conquered and taken Captive by the *Turks* in *Egypt*, was restored on Condition that he should pay a great Ransom : *Lewis* for Security of the Money,

ny, pawned to the Turk his * Pyx and Host, and he was four Years before he could get his Ransom and redeem his God, by which time, we may suppose, it was in a very pitiful Pickle. Fuller's holy War and An. 1249.

* The Pyx is a Box wherein the Host or Consecrated Wafer is put, and preserved.

Thus Transubstantiation is a Doctrine that carries Blasphemies in Capital Letters upon its Forehead.

We have now finished the second Particular, and from what is said may see, that Transubstantiation is constituted of many Absurdities, Impossibilities, Impieties, and Blasphemies.

III. The Abominableness of this Doctrine will appear from the Consideration of the Consequents, Products, and Fruits of it. And certainly nothing but what is monstrous, can come out of the Womb of such a Monster. It is the Mother of Abominations, that hath brought forth and bred up (among many others) these Seven Monsters of Abomination and Impiety.

First, The real Presence in the Sacrament; or the Carnal and Corporal Presence of Christ's Body and Blood as born of the Virgin: We do positively and constantly assert and believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the Sacrament in the following Sense, that is, that Christ is present, not only in regard of,

The Efficacy of his Body and Blood is not all that is here presented to be received, as is

confessed by the true Protestant Churches of our Confession: But first and principally Christ himself — for there is a Participation, saith the Apostle, of the Body and Blood of Christ, who is exhibited, as really and truly present, not opposing real to spiritual, but to chimerical or phantastical; nor intending his presence in the Elements, as contained in them; but to the Faith of the Receiver, who hath Union with him, &c. Vines on the Sacrament, p. 118. We hold that the Body and Blood of Christ is really, that is, truly exhibited and present to the Faith of the Receiver, and we might express the real Presence, as real is opposed to imaginary or chimerical, were it not for Caption and Misunderstanding. None of ours deny the Body of Christ to be really, the spiritually eaten by a Believer, &c. Id. 125.

1. His Divinity, or Divine Nature, which is in all Places, and indistantly present with every Being.

2. His Spirit, by whose Operation the Benefits of Christ are applied to Believers.

3. Our Commemoration of him, and shewing forth of his Death in this Action: As things that are past and absent, are made in a sort present to us by a Solemn Commemoration.

4. Our Meditations and Contemplations of him in this Action: As Contemplation brings the Object of it before the Eyes of the Mind, and presents it to them.

5. Our Affections that are (or should be) here fixed upon him. The Heart and Affections fixing upon an Object, make it present; bring it to have a kind of Being with them. The Apostle *Paul, Phil. 1. 7.* tells the *Philippians, that he had them in his Heart*: Tho in regard of his Personal Presence, he was at a great distance from them, yet in regard of his dear Affection unto them, they were in his very Heart. And so in this Ordinance Jesus Christ and the Affections of true Christians do meet. I add, that,

6. The Body and Blood of Christ are present, yet not,

1st. Locally, *per indistantum*; as included in, or affixed to the Elements, as the Wine is in the Cup. In this Sense they are as far distant from the Elements, as the place where the Sacrament is celebrated is distant from Heaven. Nor,

2^{dly}. Substantially or Corporally. This follows on the former. The Signs are with us, but the Substance is in Heaven.

But they are thus truly and really present.

(1.) Sacramentally and Symbolically, in the sacred Signs and Symbols of them. His real Body is in Heaven, but we have his representative Body present with us in the Sacrament. Here the corporal Signs of it are corporally present.

(2.) Virtually; in their Virtue and Efficacy, or by a Virtual Presence and an Efficacious Influence; as the Body of the Sun is present not only upon the Surface, but in the Bowels of the Earth, *Deut. 33. 14.* Thus there is a true and real Virtue, Power, and Efficacy of his Body and Blood really present: Yea the Virtue and Efficacy of his Body and Blood (the benefits of his Passion) are no less present, and communicated to Believers, than if he were locally present.

(3.) Spiritually; that is, not in respect of their Essence, but of our perceiving and receiving of them, and their Virtue and Efficacy in nourishing us. The Spirits or Souls of Believers by Faith only do receive them, and by them, through the Efficacy of the Holy Spirit, are truly and really nourished to Spiritual and Eternal Life. Thus the Body and Blood of Christ are really present, *Non pani & ori, sed fidei & cordi credentium.* As August. *Nos Christum in Cœlis sedentem manu contrectare non possumus, sed Christum fide contingere possumus. Et hæc præsentia spiritualis corporis Christi est verissima & realissima.* Wend. Theol. 516.

In actione Coenæ præsens est Dominus, non in Signo, nec pani participato, sed cordi participantis, non exhibitione carnis vel animæ suæ, sed exhibitione spiritus & gratiæ, quæ non ore excipiantur, sed fide, cujus est id sibi præsens. reddere quod apprehendit, ut oculus quod videt. *Spanb. Dub. Evang. part. 3. Dub. 143. p. 839.* The Presence with or under the Elements is one thing, and the presence to the Soul and Faith of a Believer is another. Vines 125.

And thus we assert and believe that the Body of Christ is truly and really present in this threefold Sense : but we do utterly disown and detest this real or corporal Presence of the Papists in or under the Signs, which is the Daughter of Transubstantiation, a Daughter like her Mother, *i. e.* a very Monster, repugnant to the nature of a Sacrament, the end of the Lord's Supper, to the nature of a true Human Body, to the state of Christ's glorious Body, to the Ascension of Christ to Heaven, and, as is before shewed, to the express Testimony of the Scriptures. And this is the First-born of Transubstantiation; and I may say of it as the Martyr *Elizabeth Folke* said, who when asked, " Whether she believed the Presence of Christ's Body to be in the Sacrament substantially and really " or no ? answered, That she believed it was a substantial Lye, and a real " Lye. Or, as *Thomas Watts*, Martyr, who being examined by Bishop *Banner* about the Sacrament of the Altar, told him, " That he believed " Christ's Body to be in Heaven, and no where else ; and that he would " never believe that it was in the Sacrament : And that the Mass was " abominable Idolatry.

Secondly, The Multipresence, or manifold Presence of Christ's Body.

This is another Birth of Transubstantiation, and it is fruitful this way to a Wonder, yea to a Miracle. It is recorded in Story as a thing that was very monstrous and miraculous, that *Margaret of Holland*, Countess of *Hansburg*, brought forth 364 Children at one Birth. *Belg. Com. Wealth*, p. 127. But this was a sorry thing to be stranged at : Behold here Transubstantiation bringing forth ten times so many Christs on a Day, and Day after Day, without any intermission for one Day, in a whole Year. By this miraculous power of Transubstantiation, and the wonderful fecundity of her Womb, it comes to pass,

1. That Christ is not only in Heaven, but upon the Earth at the same time.

2. That he is not only both in Heaven and Earth, but also in many parts and places of the Earth at the same time : In *England*, *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *America*, and no Body knows in how many places at once. Yea,

3. That he is in several Parts and Corners of the same Church at once, in one Man's Hand, in another Man's Mouth, in a third Man's Pyx and Pocket, &c. And in their private Masses which are celebrated in several Corners of the same Church, and the Body of Christ created in six or seven Corners at once. Nay,

4. That he is in several parts of the same Host at once. For they tell us in plain English, and without any Circumlocution, that he is whole

A Plain Representation

in every Crumb and Point of the Host, and in every Drop of the Wine. And if so, who can tell, how many Christs there may be in the compass of one Host, or in the Wine of one Flaggon?

This is the second, it produces a Multipresence, makes Christ to be Carnally, Substantially and Corporally present in a thousand thousand places at one and the same time.

Thirdly, The Oral, Carnal, Corporal, or Bodily eating of the Body of Christ, whereby it entreteth in at the Mouth, and goeth into the Belly. This is another Monster like its Fellows that comes out of the Womb of Transubstantiation: they that believe Transubstantiation, believe that they eat Christ's real Body, Flesh, Blood, and Bones orally in the Sacrament of the Altar.

In this Sacrament,

1. We eat the Body of Christ Sacramentally, when we receive the sacred Sign of his Body. This is *manducatio signi. Et manducatio corporalis & oralis*. This may be done by Unbelievers and Wicked, who eat the Bread of the Lord.

2. We eat the Body of Christ Sacramentally and Spiritually, when we do not only receive the sacred Sign by the Hand into our Mouths, but Christ also by Faith into our Hearts. Thus true Believers eat him in this Sacrament, receiving not only the Bread of the Lord orally, but the Bread which is the Lord spiritually.

3. Besides that Sacramental eating only, proper to Unbelievers, and this Sacramental and Spiritual eating, *simul & conjunctim*, jointly and together, proper to Believers: There is a spiritual eating only out of the use of the Sacrament. This is done as often as a Christian by Faith applies Christ, and derives Spiritual Nourishment from him. Of this our Saviour treats *John 6.* and of this *Augustin* speaks, when he says, *Ut quid puras dentem & ventrem? Crede, & manducasti: credere enim in eum, hoc est panem vivum manducare.*

But this Carnal, Corporal, Oral eating, introduced by the Papists, and growing out of Transubstantiation, is,

(1.) Horribly impious and abominable. Turning Christians into Canibals, Man-eaters, Savages, that for this are justly loathed and abhorred by Mankind.

(2.) Utterly impossible. How is it possible that Christ's glorious Body now immortal and impossible in Heaven, should be eaten by poor sinful Mortals upon Earth?

(3.) Wholly unprofitable. If it were possible, yet I would ask what profit or benefit should we obtain by a Carnal and Capernaical eating of

of his Flesh in the Sacrament? The Papists confess, that it is a Spiritual Feast, a Feast for the Soul, not for the Body. *Con. Trident. Sess. 13. cap. 2.* Now how can the Food of the Soul be received by the Mouth of the Body? Or how can that which entereth by the Mouth, into my Stomach and Belly, nourish my Soul? This is a great Mystery.

(4.) Grossly absurd. For, on this it will follow, that Christ did orally eat his own Flesh and drink his own Blood, and died twice, once in the Administration of the Supper, and again upon the Cross.

(5.) Plainly inconsistent with the Spiritual Manducation or eating of his Body in the Sacrament. And,

(6.) Manifestly repugnant to the Scriptures.

Fourthly, The Sacrifice of the Mass, or Missal Oblation of a piece of Bread (which they believe to be the true and proper Body of Christ, under the kind or form of Bread) unto God the Father as a propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice both for the quick and dead. This is another Birth of the same Belly, or Product of Transubstantiation. A blasphemous Sacrifice.

1. Directly contrary to the Scripture, *Heb. 9. 26, 28. and Chap. 10. 10, 12, 14.*

2. Highly opprobrious to the Person, Priesthood, and Sacrifice of Christ: Evacuating the Sacrifice of his Death, overthrowing his perpetual Priesthood, and putting his Person under a lower degree of Humiliation, than the lowest that he condescended unto in his state of Humiliation. Then he took upon him the form of a Servant, was made in the likeness of Men, and was found in fashion as a Man, *Phil. 2. 7, 8.* But now he is put into the form of a Wafer, the likeness of a piece of Bread, and is found every where, (upon their Altars, in the Priests Hands, and Peoples Pockets) in fashion as a bit of Bread.

3. Intolerably injurious to Christians. As taking away the Lord's Table, or driving the Lord's Supper out of the Church. For the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Lord's Supper are diametrically opposite one to the other in many respects: So hereby Christian Congregations are quite deprived of this last and great Ordinance of their dying Lord, which is a Mirror of the ineffable Love of God and Christ, a visible Word, preaching Christ to the Eye, an Epitome of the Gospel, the Seal of Christ's Testament; and as a sacred Dish, wherein the Father exhibits Christ with all his Fulness unto Believers.

Ego medicus, tu aegrotus, ille minister, gratia Antidotum, vas Sacramentum.

Fifthly, The Superstitious Reservation of the Host or Wafer, after Communion, omitting the distribution, receiving, and eating in remembrance.

Nihil habet
rationem Sa-
cramenti extra
usum divinitus
institutum.

membrance of Christ, it is repositied and kept to be carried about, and accommodated to other Uses, contrary to the institution of Christ, example of the Apostles, practise of the Primitive Church, and nature of the Sacrament. For a Sacrament out of the use appointed by God, hath not the nature of a Sacrament. This is another practise of the same Descent and Race, and confirmed by the Council of *Trent*, *Seff.*

13. *Cap.* 6.

Sixthly, The Theatrical Circumgestation, or carrying of the Host in Procession : This came in at the same Door. Transubstantiation is the Mother of Popish Processions, wherein the Host is carried about with great Solemnity, for staying of Fires, laying of Tempests, driving away Devils, &c. Yea they have a stated Annual Feast, *Corporis Christi*, i. e. *Sacramenti Corporis Jesu Christi*, of the Body, or Sacrament of the Body of Jesus Christ, kept for the Honour of the Sacrament. This Feast was instituted by *Urban* the 4th about the Year 1264, to be observed the 5th Day after the *Octaves* of *Whitsunday*, upon the pretended Revelation of one *Eva* (then an Anchorets, or rather the Bawd of *Urban*, as *Baley* confesseth) as is evident from the Bull of *Urban* to this *Eva*, whereby he ordains this new Festivty to be observed *devota Turba fidelium* throughout the World : It is celebrated with great Pomp and Ceremony. The Body of Christ (as they call it) being placed in a rich Coffer, upon a costly Cushion, is carried on a white Horse gorgeously attired and trapped, &c. through the Streets, Lanes, and High-ways to be beheld and adored By all People. *Thomas Aquinas* made the Office for this Day, for which the Pope gave him a Silver Dove, whence it is, that he is pictured with a Dove at his left Shoulder.

Sevemly, The Idolatrous Adoration of the Host. Transubstantiation hath brought an Idol into the Church : As the blessed Martyr *Am Asken* said, "The Mass, as it is now used in our Days, I do say and believe it to be the most abominable Idol that is in the World. And certainly it is so, for in the Mass a God is set up to be adored,

1. That is made by a Creature, a filthy Priest.
2. That is made by a Creature of a Creature, a piece of Bread.
3. That is made by a Creature of a Creature, by a kind of magical muttering over of five Words.

This God made of Bread, and rising out of Transubstantiation, is the Idol set up in the Mass, and the great Idol that is worshipped by Papists, with bowing of Heads, bending of Knees, elevating of Hands, knocking Breasts, prostrating of Bodies, burning of Tapers, ringing of Bells,

Bells, playing on Instruments, &c. And it is the most absurd, horrible, abominable, and monstrous Idol that is, or ever was in the World. An Idol that makes the Christian Religion to become a Scorn and Derision, a matter of greatest Detestation and Execration both to *Jews* and *Pagans*. This, I say, is the great Scandal and Stumbling-block to both; That Christians worship a God made of Bread, and eat their God. A *Jew* conferring with Mr. *Wiseheart*, gave him three Reasons why the *Jews* could not be perswaded to turn Christians. "1. The Uncharitableness of Christians toward the Poor. 2. The Multitude of Images in the Temples of Christians. And, 3. The Sacrament of the Altar. "A piece of Bread (says he) baken on the Ashes, ye adore and worship, and say, that it is your God. *Acts and Mon.* 1156. The *Turks* are no less scandalized by it, who use to call the Roman Pope, *Rex Morionum*, the King of Idiots, for this reason. And *Averroes* the *Arabian* Mahometan cryed out, *Quandoquidem Christiani manducant Deum quem adorant, sit Anima mea cum Philosophis*. Let my Lot be among the Philosophers rather than the Christians, who eat that God which they adore. And upon the Fact of *Lewis* the 9th (mentioned before) who pawned his Pyx and Host, the *Egyptians* wrought a Wafer Cake and a Box in the Borders of their Tapestry, which may yet be seen in the Tapestry which is brought out of *Egypt*. And this was done in perpetual Memory of this thing, viz. That they had the Christian God in Pawn, and to make Christianity a *Deridiculum*, a matter to be derided and laughed at all over the World. And so I may allude to *Hosea* 7. *Judæo*. 16. *This shall be, or is their derision in the Land of Egypt.*

These are some of the Births that Transubstantiation hath blessed the World with.

And we have viewed it now in its Rise and Original, Nature and Constitution, Fruits and Consequents. From which we may see, that it is not only a most stupid and absurd Fiction, but also a most gross and monstrous Abomination.

In the next place we shall consider the chief Foundations that the *Romanists* would build this Doctrine upon, or the principal Arguments they go about to prove it by.

Now they endeavour to set it up and maintain it four Ways.

I. By

- I. By the Scriptures.
- II. By the Fathers.
- III. By Councils, and
- IV. By Reasons.

First, The first sort of Arguments are taken from the Holy Scriptures. And so they argue,

1. From these Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*. On these Words they bottom Transubstantiation, and their chief strength lieth in them. And the whole strength of the Argument taken from them rests on this Basis or Bottom, *viz.* That Christ said, *This is my Body*. Hence *Bellarmino* (*lib. 3. de Euchar. cap. 19.*) argues thus, These Words, *This is my Body*, do necessarily infer, either, a real mutation of the Bread, as *Catholics* hold: or a metaphorical, as *Calvenists*: but can in no wise admit the *Lutheran* Sence. *For our Lord took Bread into his Hands, and blessed it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said of it, This is my Body*: Therefore he took Bread, he blessed Bread, he gave Bread, and of Bread he said, *This is my Body*, either therefore by blessing he changed it into his Body truly and properly, or improperly and figuratively, by adding a new Signification; or he made no Change of it: if he changed it properly, then he gave changed Bread, and of Bread truly changed, he said most truly, *This is my Body*, that is, that which is contained under the form of Bread, is not Bread now, but my Body. And this (says he) is that which the *Catholics* hold, to prove that this is the true and genuine Sence of the Word: They say,

(1.) That our Saviour spake plainly, clearly, and properly, so as the Disciples might understand him, and not figuratively, darkly, and obscurely.

(2.) That we must keep to the literal Sence, and proper signification of our Saviour's Words, and he said expressly, *This is my Body*.

In answer to this Argument I would say,

1st. That many of the *Romanists* themselves acknowledg that Transubstantiation cannot be proved from these Words, both Cardinals and famous Schoolmen, as Cardinal *Cajetan*, in 3 *Thom. q. 75. Art. 2.* *Petrus de Aliaco*. Card. *Cameracensis* in 4 *Sent. dist. 12. q. 6. Art. 1.* Card. *Roffensis*, or *Fisher of Rochester*, contra Capt. *Bab. Lutheri* c. 10. and *Perrou* the great Cardinal of France professeth, "That he believed "Transubstantiation not by virtue of any necessary Consequence, or "Reason, brought by their Doctors, but by the Words of Christ as "they are expounded by Tradition. And Schoolmen, as *Biel* *Lec. 40.*

in *Can. Missa. Occam. lib. 4. sem. dist. 11. q. 6. Vasquez Tom. 3. in 3. dist. 180. Camus, loc. Commun. l. 3. c. 3. Cassand. in Consult. de Transf. p. 66. Tannerus in compend. relat. Colloq. Ration. par. 2. c. 6. p. 37.* reckons up Transubstantiation among the Points, *que in scriptura sola non continentur, nec ea sola evidentur deducuntur.* Yea Bellarmine after that he had wearied himself on this Argument, concludes it with these Words, "Albeit there were some obscurity or ambiguity in the Words of our Lord, yet that is taken away by many Councils, and the Consent of the Fathers. A Tacit Confession. But afterwards, Chap. 23. he is more express, when he says, "It is not improbable that there is not any place extant in the Scripture so express, as may, without the declaration of the Church, evidently enforce the admission of Transubstantiation.

Non est improbabile, non extare locum in Scriptura tam expressum, ut sine Ecclesie declaratione evidenter cogatur Transubstantiationem admittere.

Thus their own greatest Divines have not been satisfied that this Scripture, nor yet any other, doth afford a Foundation for Transubstantiation.

2. The Popish Sense is not true. Our Saviour by these Words, *This is my Body*, did not change the Bread into his real Body.

(1.) The order of our Saviour's Words doth evince and evidence this, For he *sank Bread*, and had them *Take and Eat*, before he pronounced these Words, *This is my Body*, which doth plainly imply and import, that the Bread was his Body, before the pronouncing of these Words, and not made or transubstantiated into his Body, by the pronouncing of them.

(2.) The manner of our Saviour's expressing himself in this matter doth also prove it. For that he directed his Speech to the Disciples and spoke these Words to them of the Bread, is past all dispute: But common Sense will tell us, That if our Saviour had intended any such thing, as a Popish Consecration and Transubstantiation by them, he would have directed his Speech to God the Father, in this or the like Form, Let this Bread be my Body, or to the Bread, saying, Be thou my Body, and not to the Disciples.

3. The Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*, are Words of Signification, not of Transubstantiation, assertive and declarative, not operative and conveyive Words. I say, they are declarative Words of that which is, signifying what the Bread is, before the Words be pronounced, and not imperative and effective of that which is not, but shall be after they are pronounced, that is, they signify, that the Bread is his Body before, and not only after they are pronounced. The Romanists being pinched with this, do some of them (as is shewed by *Durand. Rat. l. 4. c. 41. n. 15. and Thom. 2. par. 3. q. 78. Art. 1.*) make this Evasion, That

Christ

Christ in the institution of this Sacrament used these Words twice, first secretly to consecrate the Communion, and then openly to instruct the Communicants, in this order, 1. *He took the Bread*, 2. *He blessed it*, by saying, *This is my Body*, and then, 3. *He brake it and gave it*, saying, *Take, eat, This is my Body*: first he used it to Consecrate, and then the second time to shew his Apostles the form of Consecration. This they say, but if we will not be so kind as to take their bare word, they can never prove it.

4. There is as good ground to infer and conclude, that our Saviour is really and substantially changed into a Door, a Vine, a Rock, a Foundation, a Lamb, a Lion, a Rose, a Star, a Sun, &c. from *Joh. 10. 7. Joh. 15. 1. 1 Cor. 10. 4. Isa. 28. 16. Joh. 1. 29. Revel. 5. 5. Cant. 2. 1. Rev. 22. 16. Mal. 4. 2.* as there is to infer Transubstantiation from these words.

5. If it were true (as it is not) that our Lord Jesus Christ did convert the Bread into his Body, by pronouncing these words over it, yet how doth it follow, That the massing Priest doth the same, by saying over the same words? Till they can prove that their Priests have this Power from Christ lodged in them, it may more rationally be inferred, that as often as they read these words, *Let there be Light*, they make Light by reading of them, because God did make it by them.

6. The true meaning of the words, *This is my Body*, is not then as the Romanists say, this that was Bread, is now transubstantiated into my Body: For when he said, *This is my Body*, by [*This*] he meant and understood that which he then held in his Hands, now when he pronounced the word [*This*] he held nothing but Bread in his Hands, and therefore by [*This*] he meant the Bread that he had in his Hands, and gave and commanded them to eat, as before.

But the meaning is, This Bread I have taken, blessed, broken, and give you to take and eat, is my Body, that is, a sacred Sign of my Body, my Body Sacramentally and Symbolically, as much as to say, a Representation and Memorial of my Body.

The Change is in Signification, not of Substance, in regard of Use and Office, not of Nature and Being. It remains to be Bread as it was before, in Nature and Substance, and is the Body of Christ in Signification and Representation, which it was not before. Yet this is not a bare Significant Form, as this, *The Field is the World*, *Mat. 13. 38. &c.* signifies the World: Or, as that *Rev. 1. 20. The seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches, and the seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches*; i. e. do signify the seven Angels and Churches; and many such like. But it is a Sacramental Form, wherein together with the

the Representation and Signification there, is a real Exhibition of the Thing signified. The Bread is his Body, a representing, exhibiting and conveying Sign of his Body, at once both representing and exhibiting, and conveying Christ crucified, with the Benefits of his Cross and Passion, to the Faith of a true Christian or Believer.

We come to the Reasons alledged for the Popish Sense.

First; They say, Christ spoke clearly and plainly, so as the Disciples might easily understand his meaning.

1. And I say so also. It is not to be called once into question, whether our Lord spoke plainly and spertly, so as the Disciples might understand him or no.

2. I say moreover, that it is as unquestionable, that the Disciples did both readily and well understand our Lord's words; and also in the Sense that we understand them; this can be no more doubted of by any that are not prepossessed with their own Sense, than the other: For they were both acquainted with the Language of the Scripture, where in our Sense of these Words of our Saviour is very ordinary and frequent in many Propositions and Expressions; and they were also acquainted with their own Language, that hath not (as is observed) any proper word for [signify] but makes use of [is] instead thereof, whence this Style and Sense was usual and common among them, an ordinary form of Speech. Besides all this, the Disciples never questioned their Lord and Master about the meaning of this Proposition, whereas we find them often asking him of the meaning of Speeches that he used, which were incomparably more easy for them to understand, than the meaning of these words, if they had apprehended, or suspected them to carry any thing of such a meaning in them, as the Papists put upon them. And therefore I say again,

3. That this Reason they bring for their Sense of them, doth quite destroy and overthrow their Sense of them; if he spoke plainly, and so as the Disciples might well understand his meaning, when he said, *This is my Body*, as they say he did, then certainly he did not mean, that the Bread he had in his Hand was transubstantiated and converted into his real Body, and that his very Body was contained under that Form of Bread in his Hand: For verily this is a Sense not easie to be understood, but must without all question have startled, amused, and posed them all exceedingly to conceive or understand, how he could sit at the Table with them, as they saw he did; and at the same time give to every one of them his whole Body to be eaten, and his Blood

Cum istis verbis non sine turbati, planum est intellexisse ea metonymice ex more Scripturæ, præsertim cum paulo antequam comedissent Agnum, qui eodem sensu, Pascha, id est, transitus appellatur. Exod. 12. 27. Bucan. Loc. Com. Loc. 48. q. 50.

E

to

to be drunk; yea to eat his own Body, and drink his own Blood before their very Faces; this would have been hard indeed to understand, yea, a matter passing all Understanding, that could never have been beaten into their Brains.

Secondly; They say, the literal Sense, and proper Signification of our Saviour's Words must be kept, and he says of that he gave, *This is my Body*, this is the $\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\gamma\omega$, the very plain Letter of the Words, and from this literal Sense we must not depart in this matter.

Answer.

2 Tim. 3. 16.

2 Pet. 1. 21.

1. *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God; and holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*; inspiring not only the Matter, but the Words and Phrases delivered by them; which Words and Phrases do always signify and express his Mind unto us about the Matter so delivered in them.

2. When the proper and literal Signification of Words and Phrases in the holy Scripture, doth contain and carry in it manifest Absurdities, Contradictions, or Impossibilities, that cannot be the Sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost in those Words and Phrases; but they must necessarily be taken in an improper and figurative Sense. Hence,

3. In interpreting of many Scripture Words and Forms of Speech, we must depart from the Letter of the Words, if we will understand and take them according to the true and proper sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost in them. (And the Sense of the Scripture is the Scripture). Thus we must understand *Gen. 40. 12. The three Branches, are three Days.* And *Verf. 13. The three Baskets are three Days.* *Gen. 41. 26. The seven Kins are seven Years; and the seven Ears are seven Years.* *Ezek. 37. 11. These Bones are the whole House of Israel.* *Dan. 7. 17. The four Beasts are four Kings.* *Mat. 17. 24. This is Elias.* *Mat. 13. 38. The Field is the World.* *John 10. 9. I am the Door.* *Joh. 14. 2. I am the true Vine.* *Rev. 1. 20. The seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches.* *Rev. 17. The seven Heads are seven Mountains,* &c. In all which we must depart from the literal Sense, and by the Signs figuratively signifying, understand the Things signified and represented. And so we must go from the literal Signification in all those places which speak of God, as having a Mouth, Eyes, Ears, Hands, and other Parts of a Human Body, &c.

4. In Sacramental Propositions, nothing is more frequent and familiar, than improper and figurative Forms of Expression (*quo signo nomen non est significat*) wherein the Sign is called by the Name of the Thing signified; this we may see in the Sacraments of both Testaments,

Testaments, in the Institution whereof the Lord used improper Expressions. The Rock that followed the Israelites, is called Christ, now it was but a Figure of Christ. 1 Cor. 10. 4.

In the Institution of Circumcision, Circumcision is called the Covenant, *Gen. 17. 10.* which properly was but a Seal or Sign of the Covenant, *Ver. 11.* In the Passover, the Lamb is called the Passover, *Exod. 12. 11.* which properly was only the Sign of the Lord's passing over the Houses of the Israelites. And so in the Institution of this Sacrament, there are (as the Papists cannot deny,) several improper and figurative Terms; as when the Cup is put for the Wine in the Cup, *1 Cor. 11. 25.* Drinking of the Cup, for drinking of the Wine, *Mat. 26. 27.* The Cup which is the Seal of the New Testament, is called the New Testament, *Luke 22. 20.*

And so here, when he saith of the Bread, *This is my Body*, he speaks of it not in a proper and literal, but in a sacramental and figurative Sense, calling the Sign by the Name of the Thing signified thereby, *viz.* his Body; and this is the true Sense of the Words, this Bread is the Sign of my Body; which Sense whosoever gainsays and rejects, to take the Popish Sense, bringeth all the fore-named Absurdities, Contradictions, Impieties, and Blasphemies into our Saviour's Words: But certainly this could never be the meaning of our Lord in them.

5. The Papists, who contend thus earnestly for the literal Signification, do not keep to *ἐν τῷ*, the plain Letter of our Lord's Words, for he says *ἐν τῷ* expressly, *This is my Body*; but they understand it as spoken of that which is contained under the Accidents of Bread, and resolve this Proposition, *This is my Body*, thus; This that is contained under the form of Bread, is my Body: Or thus, *Hoc complexum Accidentium Panis & Corporis mei, est Corpus meum*; this Compound of the Accidents of Bread and my Body, is my Body; a plain departure from the Letter. Moreover, Christ meant his own true and natural Body, signified by the Bread; they understand an invisible Body, without human Shape, just Dimensions, distance of Parts, &c. hid under the Accidents of Bread.

6. The Words of our Saviour are against Transubstantiation; and being taken in their own Sense, do overturn it. For they say, 1. That they must be taken in their proper Sense, *ut sonant*. 2. That thus taken, they do infer Transubstantiation. But now take them so, and (according to their Principles) they neither infer Transubstantiation, nor can there be any Transubstantiation: For if there be any such a thing, it must be either,

- 1st, Before the Words are pronounced. Or,
- 2^{dly}, Not until the Words are fully pronounced. Or,
- 3^{dly}, Together with the Pronunciation, and while the Words are in pronouncing. Or,
- 4^{thly}, In an instant and uncertain moment of Time.

But it can be in none of these, and therefore there can be no Transubstantiation. *Scharp. Curs. Theol. de Cena*, p. 1482.

Transubstantiation cannot be,

1st, Before the Pronunciation of the Words, *This is my Body*. For tho they disagree (not a little) among themselves about the Form of Consecration, yet they are most generally of this mind, That it is done by the Virtue of these Words-canted over the Bread; and that before they are used, it is very Bread.

2^{dly}, Nor not until the Words are fully pronounced: For if so, this Proposition would be false, *This is my Body*; and instead of saying, *This is my Body*, it should be said, *This shall be my Body*: For *est* [is] in its proper Sense signifies a thing then in being, and presupposeth that to be whereof it is spoken. So that if the Bread be not transubstantiated before the Priest have said over these Words, then he lies every time he saith them, in calling that which is very Bread and nothing else, the very Body of Christ.

3^{dly}, During the Pronunciation of the Words, or while they are in pronouncing: For then it should not be in an instant, but successively, *pedetentim*, by little and little, as the words are successively pronounced by Letters, Syllables, and Words one after another: but this they all deny.

4^{thly}, In an instant; this they are for. *Barbarian* determines that it is done *simul*, in the time of the pronunciation of the words of Consecration, but not in the whole time that the Pronunciation takes up, but in an instant or moment of that Time. To this it may be said,

1. Then the Priest lies in saying, *This is*, and should say, *This shall* be my Body.

2. Then the great operative and converseive Virtue of these mighty Words lies in the last Syllable [*um*]: this seems to be the Opinion of *Thomas*. *Conversio Panis in Corpus Christi fit in termino prolationis verborum. Tunc enim completur significatio hujus locutionis*; in 1 Cor. 11. 24.

3. Then as the Body of Christ is created in an instant, so the Bread is annihilated, or ceaseth to be in an instant.

4. Then

4. Then it is either at one and the same instant, that the Bread vanishest, and the Body of Christ succeedeth in the room, or another instant: but it is neither of these.

(1.) Not the same instant: For then the Bread and Body of Christ should be both together, and at the same time under the same Accidents: But this the Papists will not hear of, but affirm constantly, That first the Bread only, and secondly, the Body of Christ alone is under the Accidents one after the other, but never together.

(2.) Not another instant: For then in the interpace, the Accidents should subsist without either the Substance of the Bread, or Body of Christ under them; but they say it is never thus, but either the Bread or Body of Christ is contained under the Accidents; and to say otherwise would be most absurd.

And thus if they will be constant to their own Sentiments, tho we should grant them their own Sense of our Saviour's Words, they will not serve their turn, nor be a Foundation to build Transubstantiation upon, but contrary-wise, will quite subvert this *Dagon*.

For there can be no Transubstantiation.

1. Before the Words are pronounced.

2. After they are pronounced.

3. In the time of Pronunciation.

4. In any other instant; and therefore there can be none at all.

We have done with their first Argument.

Secondly: They argue from the Sermon which our Saviour preached unto the *Capernaumites*, *John 6*. wherein they say, he opens the great *Messiah* and Mystery of the blessed Sacrament of the Altar: In which his true Body and Blood, or Himself is eaten and drunken under the forms of Bread and Wine, which doth necessarily infer a Transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine into his very Body and Blood. The places urged for this are *Verf. 41.* unto *Verf. 59.* but they insist especially on *Verf. 51, 53, 55.* here, say they, our Saviour expressly affirms;

1. That his Flesh is Bread. *Verf. 51. I am the living Bread, which came down from Heaven. If any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: and the Bread that I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.*

2. When the Jews contended about this Saying, as absurd, or impossible, *Verf. 52. How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* he again with an ingeminated asseveration affirms, That what he had asserted,

was

A Plain Representation

was not only true (and no way absurd nor impossible) but also, that this eating of his Flesh, and drinking of his Blood, was most necessary and beneficial; *Verf. 53, 54. Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. Whoso eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day.*

3. That his Flesh is Meat, and his Blood is Drink indeed. *Verf. 55. For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed, i. e. true Meat and Drink, or truly Meat and Drink, or very Meat and Drink;* so that (say they) it is plain, that here he doth not speak improperly, but most properly of his Body as proper Meat, and of his Blood as proper Drink, and of the proper and bodily eating and drinking of his very Body and Blood with the Mouth in the Eucharist. And this doth undeniably prove Transubstantiation, that the Bread is turned into his real Body, and the Wine into his Blood.

This is the Argument for Transubstantiation, drawn from this Sermon of our Saviour preached at *Capernaum*. Our Saviour having miraculously fed five thousand with five Loaves and two Fishes, a great Multitude flocked after him, whereupon he took an occasion to preach to them of Spiritual Meat under a Metaphor taken from the present matter, as in *Chap. 4.* he had taken occasion from the Water of *Jacob's Well*, to preach to the Samaritan Woman of the Water whereof who-soever drinks, shall never thirst. And in this Sermon he shews them;

1. That there was a kind of Meat which would endure to everlasting Life, which they should seek for rather than the Meat which perisheth.
2. Who it is that giveth this Meat.
3. What this Meat is, *viz.* his Flesh and Blood.
4. That this is a more excellent Meat, than that Corporal Food which they had been fed with, and followed him for; and than the Manna which their Fathers had eaten in the Wilderness, as it was Corporal Food only, and received by the Mouth into the Belly, and so he here speaketh of it, and not as it was a Temporary Sacrament to their Fathers.

But to come to the Matter lying before us; In order to a clear and satisfactory Answer to the Argument drawn hence, which they place great Confidence in, I shall endeavour to shew;

1. our Saviour's Sense in this Sermon.
2. The Popish Sense that is put upon it.
3. That our Saviour, in this Sermon, is not treating of the Sacrament, and Sacramental eating and drinking of his Body and Blood.

But,

But, 4. That our Saviour is here treating of the Spiritual eating and drinking of his Body and Blood, out of, or without the Sacrament.

And so Transubstantiation will fall to the Ground, if they have no better Foundation to fix it upon.

First, Our Saviour's Sense in this Sermon, and how we must understand him if we will understand him in the Sense intended by him. And here are four Things to be enquired into.

1. What kind of Meat this is which our Saviour discourses of to the *Capharnaits* in this Sermon. And it is not Corporeal Meat, but Spiritual Meat. Even as *Chap. 4.* He speaketh to the *Samaritan Woman* of a Water, whereof whosoever shall drink, shall never thirst; which is not meant of a Material Water, but Spiritual Grace, as the Papists do confess. Yea this they do freely grant here. For tho they will have it to be Material Food, and to be eaten Orally and Corporally, yet they confess that it is Spiritual Meat, Meat for the Soul, not for the Belly. *Mentis, non ventris; animæ, non corporis.*

2. What this Spiritual Meat properly is. Now this is Christ himself with all the Benefits and Fruits of his Cross and Passion. This Meat is made up of, and consisteth in the saving Benefits, prepared for us by the Body and Blood of Christ crucified; and rising out of his Passion. This is the Food, Meat, Bread which he here speaketh of, that giveth Life to the World, and whereof he that eateth, shall live for ever. If it be said this cannot be his Meaning, for he delivered this Sermon before his Passion, yet speaks of an eating and drinking that was a present Duty, so that he could not have this Meaning. I say, it is true, both that Christ spake this before his Passion, and the eating he speaks of was a present Duty. But what then? distinguish between the Time of his Death, and the Merit of his Death, and the Difficulty is solved. *He is the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World. Rev. 13. 8. i. e.* In regard of the Merit, Fruits and Efficacy of his Death, and the Faith of Believers. Not only before his Passion, but before his Incarnation; the Fathers did all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and did all drink the same Spiritual Drink. For they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them: And that Rock was Christ. *1. Cor. 10. 3, 4.* Abraham saw his Day. *Job. 8. 56.* And the Apostle giveth this Account of him, *Jesús Christ the same yesterday, to day, and for ever, Heb. 13. 8.*

Passio Christi profuit, antequam fuisset. Beneficia Christi valent tam antequam, quam retrorsum. Ex eo tempore valet ad servandum genus humanum, ex quo in Adam est viciatum.

3. In what Respect he here calls them by the Names of Bread, Meat, and Drink.

(1.) Not in regard of their Nature and Substance: As if the very Flesh and Blood of Christ were (according to the bare sound of the Words):

Words) Very Meat and Drink, such as our Corporeal Food is, But,

(2.) In regard of their Effect: the saving Benefits of his Flesh and Blood, or Passion, nourish the Souls of the Faithful, and preserve them unto Eternal Life; even as Corporal Meat that we eat doth minister Aliment to our Bodies, and preserve our Natural Lives. And thus as it is the Property of Meat and Drink to maintain the Lives of them that eat and drink thereof, and as whatsoever being eaten and drunk doth maintain Life, is therefore called Meat and drink: So it is the proper Nature of the Fruits and Effects of his Body and Blood to nourish the Souls of them that partake thereof to Eternal Life. And therefore for their performing that to Souls, which Meat and Drink do to Bodies, he calls them by the Names of Meat and Drink.

4. What kind of eating and drinking this is that he speaks of: Or, what our Saviour means by eating of his Flesh, and drinking of his Blood? What this Manducation of this Spiritual Meat is? And this is only Spiritual eating by Faith, *extra Sacramentum*, without the use of the Sacramental Signs. The *Romanists* confess that he speaks of this kind of eating in this Chapter from the 32^d to the 50th verse; but then from ver. 50. to 59, of eating Orally and Corporally. But we say he speaketh only of Spiritual Manducation in this Chapter; which doth consist in a partaking by Faith of the Merit, and Virtue of his Death, the Fruits and Effects of his Passion for us. And thus a true Believer eats the Flesh and drinks the Blood of Christ Spiritually, when he,

Per manducationem nihil aliud intelligit quam actum fidei, qui consistit in apprehensione & applicatione beneficiorum Christi.

(1.) Believes that Christ's Body was Crucified, and his Blood shed for him for the Remission of Sins. And,

(2.) Believeth that by this Passion Jesus Christ hath obtained Remission of Sins, and Eternal Life, for them that do unfeignedly believe in him. And when

(3.) By this true and lively Faith he doth embrace and close with Jesus Christ, apply him to himself, and from him thus received or manducated receiveth a daily Confirmation and Increase of Spiritual Life and Growth.

Thus then, 1. The Meat our Lord speaketh of, is Spiritual Meat. 2. This Spiritual Meat is the saving Good prepared for us, by the Body and Blood of Christ crucified for us. 3. He calls these Fruits of his Passion, his Body and Blood; because they are obtained by, and rise out of his Flesh and Blood sacrificed on the Cross. 4. This eating of his Flesh, and drinking of his Blood (which he calls by the Names of Bread, Meat, and Drink) is a Spiritual manducating or eating by Faith.

This is our Saviour's Sense, which is embraced by the true Protestants, or *Calvinists*, as *Bellarmino* calls them.

Secondly,

Secondly, The Popish Sense of this Sermon. This is hinted before. And in short,

1. They confess that the kind of Meat he speaketh of, is Spiritual Meat. But then they affirm,

(1.) That this Meat is truly and properly the true and proper Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ. And,

(2.) That this eating, is an Oral and Corporal eating of his true and proper Flesh and Blood. A Manducation that is performed by Mouth.

(3.) That the Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ is thus eaten orally and corporally by the Communicants in the Eucharist. This is their constant Tenet, that in the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, under the Forms of Bread and Wine, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are received orally and corporally, and that is eaten, this is drunk.

(4.) That this Bodily eating and drinking in the Sacrament, is the eating and drinking that is properly and primarily meant by our Lord in this Sermon. *Et de quâ agitur.*

This is the Mind of the *Romanists*. Now in the next Place I am to shew,

Thirdly, That our Lord Jesus Christ in this Sermon, is not treating properly of the Sacrament, and Sacramental eating and drinking of his Flesh and Blood; much less is he here teaching the Popish Doctrine of Oral and Bodily eating and drinking his true and proper Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament.

In this Point we have the Consent of the *Lutherans*; yea we have the Suffrage of divers learned Papists who quit this Argument, and positively affirm, That our Saviour in this Chapter doth not treat of the Sacrament. As *Biel in Can. Missæ*. Card. *Cajetan in Thom. par. 3. q. 80. Art. 8.* Card. *Cusan Ep. 7. ad Bobemos*, and many others. Inasmuch that *Maldonatus* on *John 6. 53.* complains sadly, that some Catholicks chose to think and speak in this Controversy, as Hereticks, rather than as the Orthodox; and tho he forbear to name them, yet he gives their Character in these Words, *Scio Catholicos, scio Doctos, scio Religiosos ac Probes Viros esse*. So that by the Jesuits own Confession, we have Catholicks, and Catholicks that are Learned, and Religious, and Honest good Men on our side. Yet if this be nothing, we have not only learned Men, but an Infallible Pope voting for us, and expounding our Lord's Words as we do, viz. *Innocent the 3d.* (under whom Transubstantiation was first decreed) who speaking of our Saviour's Words *John 6. 53.* hath these Words. "The Lord speaketh of Spiritual eating, saying, *Except ye eat*

Hoc caput non proprie & perfecte ad doctrinam de Cœna pertinet. Chamm. Ham. p. 1134. De spirituali comestione Dominus ait, nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, & biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. De Myst. Missæ. l. 4. c. 14.

A Plain Representation

"the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you."

Now that our Lord Jesus Christ is not here speaking of the Participation of the Sacrament, or eating of his Body and Blood in the Sacrament, will be evident from these:

1. The Sacrament of the Eucharist was not then instituted; nor, as some think, of two years after this; or, as others (who make the Passover, (v. 4.) the third Passover after his Baptism) not until more than a full year after: And therefore he could not speak of an eating of his Flesh and drinking of his Blood in the Sacrament, that was not then in being, nor of so long a time after.

If it be said, True indeed, it was not then in being, but yet he spoke with reference to it, and to instruct them beforehand in the Mystery of this Meat which was to be prepared for them in the Eucharist. To this I say,

(1.) How could they to whom he spoke possibly understand any thing of his meaning, when speaking with relation to a thing that was not, nor whereof they had either then, or before, any intimation, or least insinuation that such a thing should be? They say elsewhere, that he spoke plainly and intelligibly, and it may very reasonably be supposed that now he speaks to be understood, and of a matter that might be understood by them, but it can hardly be imagined how they could understand this Discourse to be meant of a Sacrament, a Sacrament neither before, nor then once mentioned, nor instituted and in being of a Year or two after.

(2.) Jesus Christ was the Bread of Life at that very time when he preached this Sermon, v. 35. *I am the Bread of Life*; v. 48. *I am the Bread of Life*. And again, v. 50. Thus he speaks of that which then was, before the Sacrament of his Supper was instituted.

(3.) Our Saviour proposeth and presseth the eating of his Flesh and drinking of his Blood, as a present and necessary Duty: A Duty that all those that were present and heard him, were then obliged unto. And therefore it must necessarily be granted, that this Meat was then in being, and might be eaten by the Faithful, but they could not then eat it in the Sacrament, which had no being, nor was instituted.

This is the first thing, that plainly proves, that our Lord and Saviour is not here treating of Sacramental eating and drinking; the Sacrament was not instituted.

2. The eating and drinking which he here speaks of, are necessary to Salvation; Acts that he makes so necessary Conditions of Life, as no Man can be saved without them. v. 53. *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son*

See of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you. It is an eating and drinking without which none can have Life: So that if our Saviour mean it of Sacramental eating and drinking, no Man can be saved that hath not received the Sacrament. And from hence it was that the Fathers, who took this Sermon to be meant of the Sacrament, being moved by these Words, ordered the Eucharist to be given, and gave it to Infants as soon as they were baptized, as necessary to their Salvation: And indeed this doth necessarily follow this Exposition of our Saviour's Words. But from this very thing it is evident that our Saviour's Words cannot be meant of Sacramental eating; because that Sacramental eating is not absolutely necessary to Salvation, so as no Man can be saved except he have, once at least, taken the Sacrament: For many, who never ate his Flesh nor drank his Blood in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, are certainly saved. All the Faithful that lived and dyed before the Incarnation of Christ, ate the same Spiritual Meat, and drank the same Spiritual Drink, and are saved, as our Adversaries will not deny; yet none of them did ever once eat it in the Eucharist. The penitent Thief went from the Cross to Paradise immediately, yet had never eaten the Sacrament. Many thousand Infants and Children of Christian Parents dye one Generation after another before they have once tasted of the Sacrament. Are all these Damned? There have been, and are, abstemious Persons who cannot brook the least sup or drop of Wine; Must all these (who are suspended from Drinking, by a natural and sinless Infirmity, or Antipathy to Wine) be given up for Lost?

They think to evade the Force of this Argument, that falls so convincingly upon them, by this sorry shift, viz. That our Saviour here speaks of them only who have Means and Opportunities of receiving his Flesh and Blood in the Eucharist; which these here instanced in, never had.

But I answer, That the Words of Christ are true, simply, and absolutely without Exception or Limitation. And no one can have Life, or be saved without a real and actual participation of the saving Benefits prepared for Souls by the Body and Blood of Christ Crucified: And this Participation is the only manducation or eating that is meant in this place.

3. The eating and drinking of his Flesh and Blood, which he here speaks of, is always accompanied with Life and Salvation to all those who so eat his Flesh and drink his Blood. See v. 50, 51, 54, 58. *A Man may eat thereof and not die. If any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever: And whose eateth hath Eternal Life.* Mark, this is an eating whereby all Men whosoever, have Life, and are certainly saved: And therefore this eating is not Sacramental eating with the Mouth,

nor doth stand in partaking of the Eucharist. For many eat and drink in the Sacrament who have no Life, nor are saved. It is believed by many that *Judas* did partake in the Sacrament, as well as the other eleven, yet was the Son of Perdition. And it is plain in the case of Hypocrites and Wicked Men, who receive the Sacrament again and again, may be a hundred times over, yet have no Life, nor dying so (as we may fear not a few do, after many a Sacrament) are saved. But if our Saviour had indeed meant this of Sacramental eating, then it would follow, that the worst of Men, by participating (if but once in all their Lives) of the Sacrament, should thereby have their Salvation infallibly secured.

Yet here again the Papists would creep out by the help of a pretended Implication in our Saviour's Words; *viz.* That eating and drinking worthily is implied, and to be understood as necessary to the sense of the Words: And so when our Saviour expresseth himself in those Terms used, *v. 50, 51, 54, 58.* he means all, and only, of them who eat and drink his Flesh and Blood worthily. But,

(1.) This [*worthily*] is their own Addition to our Saviour's Words. For our Saviour neither hath it, nor any thing that implieth it in these Verses, or in this whole Sermon on this Subject.

(2.) As it is their Addition, so it is built upon a false Supposition, *viz.* That Men may eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of Christ (in his Sense) unworthily. Whereas he is here speaking of such eating and drinking of his Flesh and Blood as must certainly and necessarily be worthily done, and cannot be done otherwise. A Man may take the Signs of his Body and Blood unworthily. And therefore the Apostle speaks of eating the Bread and drinking the Cup of the Lord unworthily in the Sacrament, *1 Cor. 11.27.* But no Man can either in, or out of the Sacrament, receive the thing signified unworthily, *viz.* Christ and his Benefits, or truly believe in, and apply Christ to himself unworthily. If this be done at all, it is done worthily, and cannot be otherwise.

4. The eating and drinking he here speaks of, is ever followed with his dwelling in them, and they in him, who so eat his Flesh and drink his Blood; *v. 56. He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* He in me, and I in him. As much as to say, as there is a near and inseparable Union betwixt us, he is united to me, and I am united to him; as there is a Union of the Body and Food. And this again makes it plain, that he speaks not of the Sacramental eating with the Mouth, or of receiving the Eucharist. For then when wicked Men, who are Enemies to the Cross of Christ, have once received the Sacrament, they should thenceforth dwell in him, and he in them, have a Spi-

ritual

ritual Union to, and Communion with him: Yet it is certain there is no such a thing, as he will one Day make them all to know; *Mat. 7. 23.*

These four plainly prove this, *viz.* That our Saviour is not here speaking of the participation of the Sacrament, or of Sacramental eating and drinking, and much less of the Popish Oral and Corporal eating and drinking of his true and proper Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament, under the forms of Bread and Wine. I may add farther,

5. That our Lord Jesus Christ plainly obviates and prevents this gross and carnal Sense of his Words; *v. 63. It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing: the Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* Here, I say, he expounds his meaning in this Discourse.

It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; *i. e.* the Humanity profits nothing without the Divinity. The Flesh or Human Nature, of it self and alone, hath no quickning Efficacy, but in conjunction with the Spirit, or Divine Nature, from which it receives this quickning Power and Efficacy. The Divinity is the Fountain from which this Vertue flows, the Humanity is the Chanel by which it is derived unto us.

Deitas in Christo, seu vis illa Deitatis in Christo, est causa propriè, cur caro sit vere cibus, & vivificet.

Ille Iesus Christi

si solus, qui est totius Christi, & utriusque naturæ, valet ad vitam, is autem non corporalis, sed spiritualis est per fidem. Nec audent dicere se unà cum humana Christi natura devorare quoque Deitatem ipsam. *Rollor. in loc.* Caro quidem Ceterorum omnium quicquam vere non prodest. Caro autem Christi, quia in ipse unigenitus Dei filius habitat sola vivificare potest. *Cyril. l. 4. in Job. c. 23. See Bucer. loc. 48. qn. 112.*

The Words that I speak unto you, i. e. of eating my Flesh, and drinking my Blood, *they are Spirit, and they are Life:* 1. They are to be understood; not after a gross and carnal manner, but in a spiritual Sense, and so they are Life, or confer Life. To this the Decretal of the *Romish* Church agrees, in the 2d. distinction of Consecration, in the Canon *prima quidem*: where we have these Words. Understand that which I say spiritually. "You shall not eat that Body which you see, nor drink the Blood which those that crucify me will shed; I have recommended a sacred Sign to you, which being understood spiritually, will quicken you."

Verba quæ locutus sum ad vos, spiritus & vita sunt, intellexistis spiritualiter? Spiritus & vita sunt. Intellexistis carnaliter? etiam sic illa spiritus & vita sunt, sed tibi non sunt spiritus est vita, qui non spiritualiter non intelligis. *Id. ex Augustino.*

6. If we should grant them thus much, that our Saviour here speaketh of the Bodily eating of his real Body, yet this would not serve their turn. For they will have the Bread to be transubstantiated into the Body of Christ; but this Discourse would prove the quite contrary, and that (if there be any Transubstantiation) it is not the Bread that is transubstantiated into the Body of Christ, but the Body of Christ that is transubstantiated

substantiated

substantiated into Bread. For our Saviour here expressly calls himself *Bread* ten times over. *v.* 32, 33, 35, 48, 50, 51, 58. So that there is far more ground to believe, that the Body of Christ should be turned into Bread, than, that Bread should be turned into the Body of Christ.

7. When they are driven from all their other Artifices whereby they would make this Sermon of our Lord to speak for them, they betake themselves to their last Refuge, and that is, that we must believe the naked Words of Christ without any Disputation or Question about them. Thus the *Romanist*, when at a pinch, says, This one Word of Christ is enough to me, when he calls his Flesh Meat indeed: I will not deny, doubt, dispute. This was the great Sin of the *Capernaics* here, *v.* 52. *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* It came not to their Mind (say the *Rhemists* on the Words) that nothing was impossible to God, that wickedly said, *How can this Man give us his Flesh?* But we may make great Profit of their Sin, believing the Mysteries, and taking a Lesson, never to say, or once think, *How?* For it is a Jewish Word, and worthy of all Punishment. To this I say, the Sin of the *Jews* here was,

1. That they denied the Matter of Christ's Words, *viz.* that there could be any such thing as the eating and drinking of his Flesh and Blood. Their *How*, was a *How* of denying the Truth of his Words.

2. That they understood not, but grossly mistook the true meaning of his Words, when he had before plainly enough shewed them, that this eating (he was speaking to them of) stood in believing, and had promiscuously used the Phrases of eating, coming, believing, for the same thing.

But it was not their Sin,

(1.) To deny that Oral Manducation (whereof they took him to speak) as a thing grossly absurd and monstrous. Nor,

(2.) To enquire humbly and modestly after the true meaning of our Saviour's Words, and manner of eating and drinking his Flesh and Blood. And so we, believing Christ Words to be true, may and ought to inquire in what Sense they are true, and after what manner Corporally or Spiritually his Flesh is to be eaten, and his Blood drunk. And it is a vain pretence of Humility that leads Men to swallow down the most gross Absurdities under a pretence of believing.

But in the mean time the Papists sin most inexcusably.

1st. In their wilful understanding of our Saviour (as the *Capernaics* did) to speak of his Material Flesh and Blood, and of a Bodily manner of eating and drinking thereof.

2^{dly}. In their violent defending and maintaining of this that the *Capernaics* denied and condemned.

We

We have done with the third thing that was proposed, namely, That our Saviour in this Sermon is not treating of the Sacrament, &c.

Fourthly; We shall add a word of the fourth, That our Saviour is here treating of the spiritual eating and drinking of his Body and Blood *extra Sacramentum*, without the Sacrament. And this will be evident, if we consider that the Manducation here spoken of, is an eating.

1. That was before the Sacrament was instituted; and true Believers did eat his Flesh and drink his Blood, when there was no Eucharist to eat and drink them in.

2. That is to everlasting Life unto all that so eat, *Vers. 54.*

3. That is absolutely necessary to Life and Salvation, *Vers. 53.*

4. That unites the Soul unto Christ, and Christ unto the Soul, *Vers. 56.* These have been brought before, to prove that he is not speaking of bodily eating, and would come in again here to confirm this.

5. The Flesh of Christ is eaten only as it is Meat: Now it is not Meat for our Body and Corporal Nourishment, but Meat of our Souls and Spiritual Nourishment, and only eaten of the Soul spiritually by Faith. In short, such as our Hunger is, that makes us desire this Meat; such as this Meat is, that we desire; and such as the Life is, that is maintained by it; such also is our eating of it. But the Hunger that makes us desire this Meat is spiritual, and the Meat we feed on here is spiritual, and the Life that is nourished by it is spiritual; and therefore our eating is only spiritual, not corporal.

6. Our Saviour doth put the matter out of question by expounding his meaning to them, and declaring that this eating stands in believing. Thus what he calls eating, that he plainly expounds to be nothing else but believing; and useth without difference the terms of Eating, Coming, Believing as *synonymous*, or Words of the same Signification, *V. 35.* here he useth Coming for Eating, Believing for Drinking. And the proper and natural Consequents of these words, *I am the Bread of Life*, are, He that eateth me, shall never hunger; and he that drinketh me, shall never thirst. But he saith, *He that cometh to me, shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me, shall never thirst*; to teach us that he speaks of an eating and drinking which is by Faith. So *Vers. 47, 48.* he shews to eat (in this Mystery) is nothing else but to believe.

Hic edere
credere in e-
um, atq; ap-
plicare eum
magis magisq;
ad animas no-
stros.

Audita devo-
randus est: in-
tellectu rumi-
nandus: & fi-
de digerens.

Aug. Titul. de Resur. Carnis. Hæc quoties agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuiamus, sed fide-
sincere panem sanctum frangimus & partimur. *Cyprian.*

Now I have done with this Argument, and from what is said, I hope it may be plain and evident to us, that our Saviour in this Sermon is not treating of the Sacrament, and a sacramental eating and drinking of his Flesh and Blood, but of a spiritual eating and drinking without the Sacrament; and so here can be no colour of a Foundation for Transubstantiation.

Yet before I leave this, I must add a word to prevent the mistaking of my meaning in what is here said, as if I had denied that Believers in the participation of the Sacrament, do spiritually eat and drink the Body and Blood of Christ. This I have not said, but that which I have asserted is, That our Saviour in this Chapter is not treating of the Sacrament, nor of eating and drinking his Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament. Yet (tho he doth not here speak of it) Believers in the due use of the Sacrament do that which he here speaks of, *i. e.* really and truly eat his Flesh and drink his Blood in the Sense here intended, *i. e.* spiritually by Faith. There is a threefold eating, as hath been hinted.

1. Sacramentally only.

2. Spiritually only.

Corpus Christi accipitur non Sacramentaliter tantum quod solum Symbolum, sed simul spiritualiter quoad rem significatam.

3. Sacramentally and Spiritually together. And thus the Sacramental eating and drinking of the sacred Symbols, when performed in a due manner by true Believers, is ever accompanied with this spiritual eating. And so, tho in this whole Sermon he treats not of the Sacrament, yet whatsoever he speaks in it of eating and drinking, &c. may be accommodated and applied to the Sacrament; wherein, I say, this that our Lord presseth on the Jews, is performed by all true Christians, and without which the Sacrament is but an empty Ceremony.

Thirdly; They argue from the words of our Saviour, *Mat. 19. 26. With Men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.* From hence they say, altho Transubstantiation be hard for Human Reason to understand, yet it is not hard for Divine Omnipotence to effect: And Christ made the Bread his Body by the same Omnipotent Power, whereby the World was made, and the Word was incarnate and made Flesh in the Womb of the Virgin. Thus they argue from the Divine Omnipotence, and oppose Omnipotence to all the Absurdities, Contradictions, and Impossibilities that Transubstantiation is clogged with, and exclaim against us, as setting our natural Reason in opposition to the Omnipotence of Jesus Christ; and even denying his Omnipotence, because we deny their Transubstantiation.

This

This is their last Argument from the Scripture: The Argument wherewith they do most delude simple People, and draw them into a blind Belief of Transubstantiation, and consequently to the Belief and Practice of all the Abominations and abominable Idolatries that are daily practised in the Mass. Now in Answer to it, I say,

1st. That we do not deny, or once doubt of Christ's Omnipotence, but constantly believe and openly profess according to the Scripture, that, *Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in Heaven and in Earth; Psal. 135. 6. in the Seas, and all deep places: And that he is able to do exceeding abundantly above that we ask or think.* But then,

2^{dly}. We deny that it is warrantable to argue from the Power of Christ to the Act, or being of a thing, without sufficient Indications, Significations, and Evidences of his Will to perform such an Act, or effect such a thing. Or, that because he can by his absolute Power do such and such things, they are therefore done. The Psalmist says, He hath done whatsoever he pleased, not whatsoever he could. He can do whatsoever he will, but he will not do whatsoever he can. We may at this rate fancy any thing of God, as if he had done it, because it was in his Power to do it. He could have made Men with Wings to fly as Birds, and as Angels are painted; or with Horns, as some Beasts, and as *Moses* is pictured, doth it follow that he hath? He could have made the Horse, or the Ox to go upright as Man: it doth not follow that he hath. He is able of Stones to raise up Children unto *Abraham*, *Mat.* 3. 9. but we do not find that he ever hath turned, or will turn Stones into Children. By this way of arguing, the *Alcaran*, and all that is contained in it, may be maintained; yea, this is the compendious and sure way to prove any thing that the wildest Heads in the World can invent. God is omnipotent.

A potentia ad actum seu a posse ad esse non valet consequentia.

Pf. 115. 3: Omnia quæ voluit non quæ potuit. Omnia quæ vult, potest, non vero quæ potest, vult. Po- test enim per- dere mundum, sed non vult. *Damas.*

Omnipotens est Deus ad faci- endam majora

& minora. Omnipotens est ad Cœlestia & Terrestria. Omnipotens est ad mortalia & immortalia. Omnipotens est ad faciendâ spiritualia & corporalia, visibilia & invisibilia. Omnipotens est ad faciendâ omnia quæ voluerit. Aliâs aliqua non potest, non potest mori, non potest peccare, non potest mentiri, non potest falli. *Aug. Strm. 119. de Temp.*

3^{dly}. We affirm that Arguments may not be drawn from the Omnipotence of Christ to confirm Doctrines that are,

- (1.) Contrary to the Scriptures. Or,
- (2.) Carry in them manifest Contradictions, or plain Impossibilities.

1. Contrary to the Scriptures: For Christ is not Yea and Nay, *2 Cor. 1. 19.* nor can he deny himself, *2 Tim. 2. 13.* and therefore to set that up by the Power of Christ, which is contrary to the Word of

G

Christ

A Plain Representation

Act. & Mon.
3 vol. p. 555.

Christ; is to set his Omnipotence in opposition to his Veracity, and by his Power to destroy his Truth, and make him a Liar. And this is the Fraud whereby the Papists seek to delude the simple. What! Is not Christ Omnipotent? Will you question the Omnipotent Power of Christ's Word? Look, look at the many and mighty Miracles that were done by it, and be not faithless, but believing. *What say you (said Bonner to Mr. Philpot) to the Omnipotency of God? Is not he able to perform that which he spoke? This is my Body. I tell thee that God by his Omnipotency, may make himself to be this Carpet, if he will. But hold a little:*

That our Lord Jesus Christ is Omnipotent we no way doubt; but we are as sure that he is also most true, and cannot lie or deceive: And therefore must (notwithstanding his Omnipotence) peremptorily deny your Transubstantiation, because it is inconsistent with the Truth, and contrary to the express Word of Christ, which plainly declares (as is shewed before) that he is ascended into Heaven, and that the Heavens must receive him; so as he shall descend no more, before that great Day when he shall descend from Heaven with a Shout, with the Voice of the Arch-angel; and with the Trump of God.

Thus Transubstantiation is contrary to the Word of Christ. And therefore, till they have proved that Christ will act in Contradiction to his own Word, and (like unto us sinful Men) say one thing, and then do quite and clean contrary; let them tell us no more what Christ can do by his Omnipotence in this case. Divine Omnipotence is to be called in for a Confirmation of the Scripture-Revelations, and Articles of Faith grounded on the Scriptures, and not for the overthrowing of them, which would be the readiest way to overthrow all Christianity.

2. Carry in them manifest Contradictions, or plain Impossibilities. We may not thus make Divine Omnipotence an Argument to prove and establish things that imply plain Contradictions; or argue from the Divine Power to the Being of Impossibles. Now things are impossible in a threefold respect.

(1.) *Simply*, simply and absolutely; that is, such things as are contrary unto, and inconsistent with the Nature and infinite Perfection of God: As for God to die, lie, sin, deceive. These are simply impossible, and to say, That because God is Omnipotent, he may therefore die, lie, &c. is no less than Blasphemy: Nor doth this derogate any thing from his Omnipotence, because they are things that suppose and argue Impotence and Imperfection. And this Impossibility is not from Impotency, but immense Perfection in God.

Magna in Deo
potentia est
non posse
mentiri. Aug.
l. 1. de Sym-
bol. c. 1.

(2.) *Ex*

(2.) *Ex Hypothesi seu Prasupposito*, upon a Pre-supposition: That is, such things as are contrary unto, and inconsistent with his immutable Counsel and Will revealed in his Word. Thus it is not a thing simply impossible with God to annihilate the Devils, or to save the Damned. Yet this is impossible *ex supposito*, upon this Supposition, that God hath decreed and revealed the contrary, *viz.* That he will never annihilate the one, or save the other. Thus, I say, this is impossible in regard of his constant and immutable Truth.

(3.) *Ex natura rerum*, in regard of the Nature of the Things themselves: that is, such things as imply a Contradiction. These are not only impossible, *Natura*, to Nature, and the Power of Secondary Causes: But they are impossible, *Natura*, in Nature, or in the Nature of the things themselves: And so impossible with God, yet it is not through defect of Power in God, that such things cannot be done; but through want of Capacity in the things which are simply impossible. The Popish Schoolmen confess, that things which imply Contradiction fall not under the Divine Power, and grant that God cannot make Contradictories to be true; together; *quia Contradictio ponit esse, & non esse & simul*. It makes a thing to be, and not to be; and to be, and not to be at the very same time; a thing that is impossible: For every thing is, or is not: Nothing can both be, and not be at the same time. It is impossible that the same Body should be in many places, or in more than one place at one time: That a Man should be both alive and dead at once: That a Child should be before, and beget his own Father, &c. *Qui diceret idem simul esse & non esse posse, nemo omnium post homines natos unquam repertus fuit. Quodlibet est vel non est. Τὸ αὐτὸ ἀπὸ αὐτῶν ὁρίζεται, ὡς μὴ ὁρίζεται ἀδυνατῶν. 3 Metaph. 3. affirmatio & negatio, (ut homo non homo, ens non ens) non sunt simul veræ. Contradictoria nec simul vera, nec simul falsa esse possunt; prima sunt ista principia, & mentibus hominum naturaliter insita.*

We may not argue from the Divine Power to the Being of Things that are impossible any of these ways. But Transubstantiation is impossible all these ways.

1. Simply. It is a thing contrary unto, and inconsistent with the Nature of God, who cannot lie. *Potenter non potest efficere, ut corpus Christi sit simul actu corpus & non corpus, simul actu circumscriptum, & non circumscriptum, quia sunt ista contra-*
2. From a supposition of his Will manifested in his Words. So it is a thing most contrary unto, and inconsistent with his immutable Truth.
3. As implying a Contradiction, and not only so, but big with many Contradictions, and those as gross, obvious, and notorious as can be imagined, as hath been shewed. When *Banner* had affirmed to *Philpot*, That God by his Omnipotence may make himself a Carpet. *Philpot* answered, *God is able to do whatsoever he willeth, but he willeth*

A Plain Representation

nothing which is not agreeable to his Word: *Non potest Deus facere quæ sunt naturæ suæ contraria.* It is contrary to the Nature of God to be a Creature, for the Creator to be a Creature.

4thly. We say, Arguments taken from the Omnipotent Power of God to prove the being of a thing, are only conclusive, and cogent, or valid, when we have a Signification of his Will to do such a thing. In this case they conclude. For whatsoever he will do, that he can do; and what he hath signified that he will do, we may firmly build upon it; that it shall be done whatsoever Difficulties or Impediments may lie in the way. Omnipotence can easily level the highest Mountains, roll away the greatest Stones, dry up deepest Seas. It was *Tertullian's* saying, *Credo quia impossibile*, I believe because it is impossible; a strange Expression, as one would think; *Yet thus must we* (says Dr. *Stillingfleet*) *taking Impossibility as relating to Second Causes; when the thing exceeds all probabilities and possibilities of Second Causes, and the ground of Faith, to be some Divine Prediction.* Orig. Sacr. p. 184.

But where we want this Evidence of his Will, we shall but unwarrantably, and without ground, expect the Effect in respect of his Power: For he can do many things that he will not do. He could have made many Worlds at once, when this was made; he could have made many Suns as well as one, he could have prevented the Fall of Man; recovered the lapsed Angels; but he hath done none of these, nor of Miriads of other things easy to have been done in regard of his Power. He can maintain our Lives without the use of Meat or Drink, give us Bread-corn without sowing and reaping, and make our Bodies immortal, never to see Death; but he doth none of these: And that Man would be thought to reason very weakly and absurdly, who should argue on this manner. God is Omnipotent, therefore I shall live without eating, or reap without sowing, or be immortal, and live for ever.

Arguments from the Power of God, only conclude the Being of those things, which he hath declared it to be his Will to give a Being unto. But here in this matter of Transubstantiation, we do not only want the Evidence of his Will for it, but have most evident Indications and Manifestations of his Will against it. I add,

5thly. That if we would grant this to them, that must never be granted, that is, That Transubstantiation is no way impossible, nor doth imply any Contradiction; yet it would rest on them to prove, that Jesus Christ doth exert and put forth his Almighty and Infinite Power in changing a bit of Bread into his very Body, Blood, and Bones,

as born of the Virgin: For we can in no wise, on no fashion see it. If there be such a Transmutation, we must say, that it is a very strange Change, nay a miraculous Change: A Miracle, a great Miracle, as great, if not much greater than his Incarnation. That God should become Man was a great wonder, as all confess: and we cannot but think it a greater wonder, and more strange, that a piece of Bread should become God; that that which was Bread in the Baker's Hand half an hour before, is now very God, our Creator, Redeemer, and Saviour in the Priest's hand. But we cannot for our Hearts believe this, that there is any such a wonderful and miraculous Transmutation. For,

Bernard *would say, that there are tria mirabilia mirabilissima.*

1. Deus & homo.

2. Virgo & Mater.

3. Fides & Cor Hominis.

This (if true) might well be added as a fourth, being as great, and far greater than any of the three.

1. It is contrary to the nature of all Miracles that ever were known to be done. It was never known, that any Miracle did at once destroy and take away the Substance, or natural Properties of the Subject whereupon it was wrought, and also leave them remaining. When *Moses's* Rod was turned into a Serpent, it was not both a Rod and a Serpent at once, assuming the form of a Serpent, yet keeping the perfect form of a Rod. When the Water was turned into Wine, it was not both Wine and Water, or Wine under the Accidents of Water. But this new Miracle both destroys the whole Substance of the Bread, and at the same time preserves and continues in their former place all the Properties and Accidents of Bread, without the least change one way or other.

2. In true and real Miracles, where a Change is made from one thing to another, the Change is obvious to the Eye, and manifest to the other Senses, striking Men ordinarily with great wonder and amazement. The Miracles of our Lord Jesus Christ were very visible and conspicuous; as when he raised the Dead, dispossessed the Devils, cleansed the Lepers, stopped the Flux, healed the Palsie, restored Sight to the Blind, Hearing to the Deaf, Speech to the Dumb, Legs to the Lame, &c. they were all very conspicuous, evident and plain to be seen. Both they upon whom the Miracles of healing were wrought, and others, who were Spectators, saw them, and were taken with great wonder at the beholding of them. *Mat. 15. 30, 31. Great Multitudes came unto him, having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus feet, and he healed them: Insomuch that the Multitude wondered, when they saw the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole, the lame to walk, and the blind to see: and they glorified the God of Israel.* John 6. 2. *A great Multitude followed him, because they saw his Miracles which he did on them that were diseased.* When he wrought that Miracle on the Fig-tree, the Disciples

ples saw it, and marvelled, *Mat* 21. 19, 20. Yea, his Miracles were so open and evident, that his greatest Adversaries could not deny them. *John* 11. 47. the Council that was called against him, gave in this Testimony, *This Man doth many Miracles.*

But now here forsooth is a Miracle of Christ, a great Miracle, a greater Miracle than any that he did, and greater than all that he did in the days of his Flesh, *viz.* A bit of Bread changed in a moment into Flesh, Blood, and Bones. A sorry Creature (that a little Mouse may carry away and eat at once) turned into the Almighty Creator of Heaven and Earth: and yet all this done without the least indication or appearance of any Change at all. For when this bit of Bread is thus changed, if we look upon it as fixedly, intently, earnestly as ever we can, we can see no Change; if we handle it, it is the same, the very same that it was; if we smell it, why! the Smell is the same; if we taste it, it hath no other taste; and if we break and crumble it as small as we can devise, still neither Flesh, Blood, nor Bone is to be found nor the least appearance of any other Substance than the Substance of Bread.

3. When our Lord Jesus Christ took a Human Nature and became Man, he plainly shewed himself to be God, by such real Miracles as were convincing Arguments of his Deity. But now when a piece of Bread, or a Wafer, is become God, this Wafer manifests no Deity for the Conviction of the World. Nay, instead of doing Miracles that might convince us of a Deity, it is still liable to those things that do prove and proclaim it to be no God. For when a Wafer is made a God, by Transubstantiation, we may still eat it, throw it to the Ground, cast it into Fire or Water, unto Dogs or Hogs, no less than when it was but a Wafer, or bit of Bread; and it can no more resist or hinder us, than it could while it was but a piece of Bread. And are these things Marks and Indications of a Deity?

This may suffice to be said to this Argument taken from divine Omnipotence. And I have also done with their Scripture Proof, or Arguments drawn from the Scripture.

*L. 3. de Euchar.
c. 20.*

II. They argue from the Fathers: From the Testimony and Authority of the Fathers. Here *Belarmine* brings in 17 Fathers for it.

I shall not enter into this Debate between them and us, having cleared the Holy Scriptures of it, it may suffice to say, as to the Fathers,

Eph. 2. 20.

1. That our Faith must be grounded upon the Word of God, not upon the Sayings or Writings of Men: The Opinion of the Fathers with-

without the Word of God is not sufficient for us to build our Faith upon.

2. That tho the Fathers were Learned and Holy Men (which we readily grant) yet they were but Men, Men subject to Errors and Mistakes; yea and Men (as none will deny) that had their Errors and Mistakes.

3. That no Authority of Man ought to prevail in matters of Faith, unless it have the Authority of God to back it. It is not their Judgment, or Authority, that must sway us, but the ground of their Judgment; i. e. if they have Scripture-Warrant for what they say. We gladly hear the Fathers, when they speak the Language of our heavenly Father: But in whatsoever they depart from this, we must depart from them. When the *Donatists* urged *Augustine* with the Writings and Authority of *Cyprian*, he replied, "Whatsoever in them agreeth with the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, I receive it with his Praise; but whatsoever agreeth not, I refuse it with his Leave. And so must we. For (as one) tho Antiquity be for a Thing, yet if Scripture be against it, the Cause is as good as ought to be with'd, Antiquity it self sitting in Judgment. *Omnes Patres & tota Schola* (as another) are not the Old and New Testament.

Si quis de antecessoribus vel ignoranter vel simpliciter non hoc observavit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo & magisterio suo docuit.

potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi, nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc a Domino admoniti & instructi sumus, ut ubique lex Evangelica & traditio Dominica servetur, & ab eo quod Christus & docuit & fecit, non recedatur. *Cyp. L. 2. Ep. 3.* Sine divina Literatura nullius momenti est antiquitas. *Tertul. Apol. c. 47.*

4. But in this Controversy about Transubstantiation, and the real Presence, the Fathers are most express, plain, and full against them. It is true indeed that they bestowed all their Eloquence on this Subject of the Eucharist, and spake many things very Rhetorically and Hyperbolically, both to procure more reverence to the Ordinance, and raise the Affections of the Communicants: which Hyperbolies and high Expressions (as in other Matters) must have their grains of Allowance: But when they come down from these high and lofty Strains of Rhetorical Florishes, they deliver themselves as positively, plainly, and fully, against Transubstantiation as can be: Calling the Elements Bread and Wine, Commemorations, Types, Figures, Symbols, &c. of Christ's Body and Blood. For this I might refer to many who have fully handled this Subject: As Dr. *Crackenthorp*, *Defence c. 73.* against *Marcus Antonius de Dominis*, Archbishop of *Spalato*, who came into England, An. 1616. And here asserted, that all the Fathers are against the real Presence, but after his last revols revoked this, and affirmed the con-

contrary. And Dr. Burnet's Discourse, annexed to the Relation of a Conference, held at London, April 3, 1676. by Dr. *Stillingfleet* and Dr. Burnet with some of the Church of Rome, &c.

L. 3. de Euchar.
cap. 21.

Una apex, ver-
bi ratione va-
lentior omni
est. Milleque
decretis concilii
prior.

III. They argue from Councils; from the Authority, Definitions, and Decrees of Councils. *Bellarmino* makes this another Argument, and tells us that for 500 Years before that time, the truth of Transubstantiation was defined, *sub Anathemate*, in six Councils one after another. But this is of least weight, for *Bellarmino's* six Councils were of the Pope's making, and such as decreed more Errors than this.

IV. In the last place *Bellarmino* argues for it, from its agreeableness to Reason. But in Articles of Faith we must draw our Conclusions, not from the Dictates of Reason, but, from the Rule of the Scripture: Yet his Reasons are very frivolous and ludicrous. It is (says he) most Consistent to Reason to admit it:

1. Because otherwise the simple will be exposed to the danger of Idolatry in adoring the Bread.

2. Because it seems not very agreeable to Reason, that the same Sacrament should be both Corporal and Spiritual Food; Meat, both *mentis* & *ventris*.

3. Because otherwise a Christian taking the Sacrament (on a Fasting-Day sure) should break his Fast.

This Stuff needs no answer. Only instead of bringing in Transubstantiation, to prevent the Adoration of Bread by the Ignorant, he might have done better, to have put them in a way of avoiding the peril of Idolatry, as often as they worship the Host: For if there be no real Presence, they confess that it is abominable Idolatry. *Costerus* saith, that the Bread-worship was the greatest Idolatry that ever was in the World, if the Bread be not turned into the true and natural Body of Christ. Now *Biel*, *Lec. 49. in Can.* saith, That there can be no evident certainty of the Conversion of the Bread into the Body of Christ, by reason of some Defects that may happen. Thus (says he) neither the Priest that celebrates, nor the People that joyn can be certain.

1. Not the Priest; because he cannot certainly know that he was truly Baptized, or lawfully Ordained; and if not, he is no Priest, nor can Transubstantiate.

2. Nor the People that Joyn; because they cannot certainly know that the Priest hath an intention to Consecrate; or if he have, that he commits not some Error in omitting something necessary to Consecration in Matter or Form. And from hence he concludes, that Adoration ought

ought to be performed always under an exprefs or tacit Condition, that we adore only, if all things have been observed that were necessary to Consecration.

I have now done with the Arguments brought by the Romanists for Transubstantiation.

I shall in the next place offer a few Arguments against it.

1. If the Bread, by Transubstantiation, be turned into the real Body of Christ, then its no longer Bread, but both the Evangelists and the Apostle *Paul*, call it Bread exprefsly in this action of the Supper, and this both before and after Consecration; but none of them once call it (as the Papists will have) Flesh, Blood, and Bones, or a bare Form, and the naked Accidents of Bread. We may see this if we cast our Eyes upon,

Matth. 26. 26. Jesus took Bread, &c.

Mark 14. 22. Jesus took Bread, &c.

Luke 22. 19. He took Bread, &c.

1 Cor. 11. 23. Took Bread. V. 26. As often as ye eat this Bread. V. 27. Whofoever shall eat this Bread. V. 28. So let him eat of that Bread.

1 Cor. 10. 16. The Bread which we break. V. 17. We are all partakers of that one Bread. And so the whole Celebration of this Ordinance is called breaking of Bread. *Acts 2. 42. and 20. 7.* Thus it is still stiled *Bread*. But if by Consecration it were turned into the Body of Christ as born of the Virgin, then it should not be Bread, nor could be called by the Name of Bread any more.

Now here *Bellarmino* and other Papists seek out several Evasions whereby they think to enervate, and take away the force of this plain and cogent Argument, giving divers Reasons, why after its essential mutation, it keeps its former Name of Bread. And they say, it is called Bread;

First, Because it is made of Bread, or was Bread before its Transubstantiation into the Body of Christ, and keeps its old Name, or takes its Name from what it was. And they give us sundry Examples of such Forms of Speech in Scripture; as *Adam* called his Wife *Bone*, because made of a Bone; *Gen. 2. 23. Moses* calls the Rods that were turned into Serpents, *Rods*; *Exod. 7. 12. Matthew* calls the Blind, *Lame, Dumb, &c.* who were healed, *Blind, Lame, Dumb, &c.* after that they saw, and walked, and talked; because they had been blind, &c. *Mat. 15. 31.* To this I say,

(1.) *Bellarmino* himself confesseth, That this Solution doth not seem to be very solid; for the Adversaries may object against it, That because sometimes a thing is called by the Name of that whereof it is made; therefore Words are every where to be taken in that Sense. And I may add that well we may; for if there be two or three places in the Scripture, wherein things are for once named from what they were, yet there are scores and hundreds that call things that which they are, for one that calls them that which they have been, but now are not, nor ever shall be again.

(2.) Tho things are sometimes denominated from what they have been; yet it cannot be so here, for Christ's Body never was Bread. And in this respect the Examples produced by them are wholly impertinent. For the Woman who is called a *Bone*, once was so; the Serpents that are called *Rods*, had been Rods, and were presently Rods again: And the Seeing, who are called *Blind*, had been so, really Blind. But that which is properly and really the Body of Christ, never was, never shall be Bread. Nay, this is their First and Fundamental Errour in this matter, *viz.* That Christ's Body is made of Bread; and here they run into the Error that Logicians call *petitio principii*. *Hoc est ejus quod in principio questionum fuit*, or into a plain begging (instead of solid proving) of that that is the main Question; and taking that for granted, which we must for ever deny. Let the Papists but once prove, that the true and real Body of Christ, was once Bread, and is made of Bread, by as fair Evidence as we will prove that the Woman was made of a Bone, and the Serpents of Rods, and the Seeing of them that had been Blind: And then they do something, and we shall yield, that this Solution, Answer, or Interpretation of theirs may be allowable, but yet not certain, by *Bellarmino's* own Confession. But that they can never do; and therefore we cannot grant, that the Body of Christ that never was Bread, nor ever shall be Bread, is called Bread; because sometimes things are called what they were, not what they are. We may observe by the way, that tho every new Vicar of Christ must have a new Name; yet by this new Divinity the old Name (tho very mean and contemptible) is good enough for the Body of Christ. Bread it was, and Bread it is at Rome.

Secondly; Because it retains the external Figure and Form of Bread, and the Scriptures call things often as they appear, and seem to be. Here again they give us Examples of this in the *Brass Serpent*, *Numb.* 21. 8, 9. *Emerods and Mice*, 1 *Sam.* 6. 4, 5. *Solomon's Cherubims*, 1 *Kings* 6. 23. *Solomon's Lyons*, 1 *King.* 10. 20. This is their second Solution. Now to this I say,

1. That

1. That the Scripture often speaketh of things, not as they are, but as they seem and appear to us, and giveth the Names of the things themselves to those things that are only the Similitudes and Resemblances of them. As in the Examples given, &c. But then,

2. This Rule doth not hold in this case, nor are the Examples brought to purpose. For,

(1.) All those were true and proper Images and Representations of the things whose Names they bare. But the Bread in the Eucharist is not an external Form, Image, or Shadow of Bread, but very Bread it self. The Brazen Serpent was not a Serpent, but the likeness of a Serpent; the carved Cherubims were not Cherubims, but the likeness of Cherubims, &c. But the Bread is true and proper Bread, and not the likeness of Bread.

(2.) The Scripture no where hinteth this, that it is called Bread, not because it was Bread, but because it hath the Form and Likeness of Bread; as it is evident that the Serpent, &c. are so called, because they had the Form and Fashion of a Serpent, &c. Nor,

(3.) Doth the Scripture any where teach us to call the bare Accidents of Bread by the Name of Bread. And Accidents are all that the Papists here allow.

(4.) The Body of Christ never was in the Form of Bread, or had the Likeness of Bread. I say moreover,

(5.) In saying that the Body of Christ is called Bread, because being made of Bread, it doth still retain and keep the Form of Bread, they with their own Hands throw down this Structure of Transubstantiation, which they would rear up. For if the Bread were really turned into the Body of Christ, it would in this Transmutation lose the external Form and Accident of Bread, and take the Form and Accident of a true human Body. Thus in all the Transmutations and Transformations that we read of in Scripture, the things transformed lost their former Form, Shape, and Accident, and took new ones. The Rib, out of which Eve was formed, lost its own Shape and Form when turned into Woman. When Lot's Wife was turned into a Pillar, she lost the Form of a Woman. Moses's Rod lost the Form of a Rod, when it took the Form of a Serpent. And the Water turned into Wine lost its former Colour, Savour, Taste. In all these there was a real and visible Mutation, that changed the external Form, Fashion, and Accidents. And so whatsoever is transubstantiated, doth thereby lose its former Form. And so it would be here, if there were any such a Transubstantiation as the *Romanists* would obtrude upon us. But this Key whereby they would loose themselves out of the Chains of this Argument, instead of locking them, locks

them closer and faster up. But they have more Keys for this Lock that may fit better. As,

Divino miraculo fieri, ut accidentia panis nutrant, ita tamen ut in magna copia sumantur. De Euch. c. 23.

Thirdly, Because it hath the Properties and Effects of Bread. But what are these? *Bellarmino* only names one, *viz.* *Nutrition*, it doth nourish our Bodies as Bread. But if it be not Bread, how comes it to minister Nourishment? Why, he tells us that, by a Divine Miracle, Accidents may nourish, when taken in a great Quantity. Mark here,

1. Accidents of Bread nourish Mens Bodies.

2. Yet it is by a Divine Miracle, and this also. Only,

3. When they take a full Dose of them. He might have done well to have prescribed a just Quantity, how many Grains, Scruples, Drams, Ounces, Pounds or Quarts of Accidents must be taken at once to make the Receipt work. But this is left to the Baker's Discretion, who may (for any thing I know) put in more or less at his own Pleasure.

But in answer to this Reason produced by them, to prove that it may be called Bread, I shall say two things,

1. That this Reason plainly proves it to be Bread. For,

(1.) That which hath the Effects and Properties of Bread in nourishing our Bodies, is a Substance. Bare Accidents, as Length, Breadth, Colour, &c. cannot nourish. And therefore if the whole Substance of the Bread be gone, and nothing of Bread (as they say) remain but the bare Accidents, there can come no Nourishment to our Bodies from them, but they say (and it is true) that they do nourish: And from thence I say it must follow that not only the Accidents, but the Substance of Bread remains. For meer Accidents do not nourish. It is confessed that Odours may and do minister some refreshing, and Examples may be given of those that have been refreshed by the Smell of Meats and Odours. But the Reason of this is, that Smells and Savours issue with the Emission of some Corporeal Substance from the Bodies they issue from. Therefore an Odour, according to *Aristotle*, is *fumida quidam Evaporatio*; according to *Galen*, *Effluxus quidam Corporum*. But this cannot behead the Papists in this Case, for according to their Hypothesis, there is no Substance of Bread in the Host, and therefore there can be no Emission of any Material Savour or Substance from it, that can afford the least Degree of Nourishment.

Omnes Theologi & Philosophi communi sensu docent, quod alimentum in rei nutritive substantiam vere convertatur. De Genari & Corp. 65. q. 11. Art. 2.

(2.) That which doth nourish our Bodies, is converted into the Substance of our Bodies. The Colledge of *Comimbre* tells us, that both all Divines and Philosophers with one Consent agree in this, that Food is truly converted into the Substance of the Body that is nourished by it. But bare Accidents cannot be turned into Substance, and therefore cannot nourish,

nourish; if there be Nourishment, then there must be the Substance of Bread.

But *Bellarmino* hath a Reserve here, that it may be done by a Miracle: and so indeed it must, if it be done.

But why should we devise and feign Miracles, when and where there is no need of them, nor occasion for them?

1. It is not once doubted, but God can, by a Miracle, nourish our Bodies without any Meat at all, when there is need, and he sees it meet. But then,

2. What need is there of a Miracle to nourish our Bodies by bare Accidents, Length, Breadth, Quantity, Colour, &c. when we have our Tables furnished and stored with all Plenty and Variety? Doth the Lord use to work Miracles, where there is no want of ordinary means, and this ordinarily?

3. I would fain know of them, for what end this Miracle is done. Is it to confirm the Doctrine of Transubstantiation? or to declare and manifest the Deity of Christ? Then certainly this ought to be visible and conspicuous, or openly displayed, that it is not any Substance of Bread, but only Accidents of Bread, that we are thus miraculously fed and nourished by. But this is not in the least apparent, nor to be any way discerned by our selves or others.

4. But the Limitation or Condition which *Bellarmino* puts in, doth in my Opinion quite marr this pretended Miracle, viz. That the Accidents may by a Divine Miracle nourish us upon this Condition, that they be taken in *magna copia*, or a great Quantity. What means this *Proviso*? Why must they be taken in *magna copia*, to make the Miracle take? Is there Restraint upon the Divine Omnipotence, so that he can feed us with many Accidents of Bread, but not with a few? Is this the Cardinal's Divinity? Strange! Here is in his Words a feigned Miracle, but a real Blasphemy, in limiting the most High, and tying up the Hands of Omnipotence. And I may, with some Variation, inform the Jesuit in the Words of *Jonathan* to his Armour-bearer, *there is no Restraint to the Lord, to save by many, or by few*; 1 Sam. 14. 6. So I say, there is no Restraint to the Lord, to feed by many Accidents or by few, if he can by many, he can also by few, and with the same Facility.

This is the first Answer.

2. This Reason plainly everts Transubstantiation. For if a Consecrated Wafer do retain the Properties and Effects of Bread, then it cannot be transubstantiated, because the Properties of Bread are founded in the Substance of Bread, and the Effects of Bread rise from the very Nature of Bread. So that if the Bread did, by Consecration, lose its Substance, it should therewith also lose both its Properties and Effects.

They

They have yet one shift more, and say, it is called Bread.

Fourthly, By a *Hebraism*, because *phrasi hebraicâ*, in the Hebrew Idiom or Form of Speech, all Meat is called Bread. This is *Bellarmin's* last Reason, and that which he likes best. It may, says he, be called Bread, & meo judicio optime, quia phrasi hebraicâ nomine panis intelligitur generatim omnis Cibus. But,

1. Till *Bellarmin* have proved that our Saviour and his Apostles called this Sacramental Element by the name of Bread, for this reason, or more *hebraico*, he doth but beg the question, and if we list to grant it him, upon his begging we may; but if not, he hath not, nor any of the Tribe of Cardinals or Jesuits can ever prove it.

2. The Apostle doth not only call it *Bread*, but τὸν ἄρτον τῆτον, panem hunc, δεικτικῶς ἢ ὑποτακτικῶς, this Bread, 1 Cor. 11. 26, 27. plainly shewing that he had not respect to that general Signification, but spake of it in its most proper sense, as it was Food made of Corn, or proper Bread, as Bread is distinguished and differenced from all other kinds of Meat: As in the same place he speaks of Wine as it was the proper Fruit of the Vine, by way of distinction from all other sorts of Liquors. Thus the Apostle calls it *Bread*, not in the general Signification of the Word, but from its own particular Nature and Kind among all other sorts and kinds of Meat; that is, proper Bread, and not any other, Fish, or Flesh, &c.

We have now the Reasons of *Bellarmin*, and other Papists, whereby they do go about to elude and evade this clear and full Argument against *Transubstantiation*.

And you may yet further take notice of these four things in general. That these Reasons (assigned by them) why the Bread after its essential Mutation is still called Bread,

1. Are divers one from another, wherein they fluctuate at great uncertainty, as not knowing where, or upon what to fix. One while they will have it called Bread, because it was Bread; another while because it hath the Form and Figure of Bread; then, because it hath the Effects of Bread. Next not so, but by a *Hebraism*. And thus they rove about at uncertainty, now say one thing, then another. It is called Bread in this sense, or in that sense, or as one of them (if not more knowing, yet more modest than the rest) having reckoned up several Opinions about it, concludes, or some other way, which the Doctors may understand, but we do not.

Vel quia ex pane conficitur, & accidentia panis retinet, &c. Vel alio aliquo modo, qui a Doctoribus comprehendipotest, a nobis non potest.

2. Are not only divers one from another, but adverse and contrary one to another; inasmuch as they cannot consist and stand one with another, but do mutually destroy one another. For if it be called Bread,

(1.) Tropically and Figuratively, according to the First and Second, then not because of its nutritive Property, according to the Third.

(2.) Because of its nutritive Virtue; then not Figuratively, as the First and Second.

(3.) If by a *Hebraism*; then none of the other three ways. And

(4.) If any of the other ways, then not *more hebraica*.

3. Are all Figurative and improper. And so they (who insist so much on, and contend so hotly for the literal Signification of our Saviour's Words, *This is my Body*, and exclaim on us for departing from it) do themselves depart from the literal Signification of this Word, *Panem*, Bread, and bring in a tropical, figurative and improper sense of it. For if it be called Bread, only because it is made of Bread, or hath the Form of Bread, or the Properties and Effects of Bread, or from the Idiomatic of the *Hebrews*, then it is Bread only in an improper Sense. And so I say, they that will not admit of a Figure in this Proposition, *This is my Body*, (tho it be necessary, and ordinary and constant in the Scripture in this Subject of Sacraments) are forced (for the Support of their Transubstantiation, and literal Signification of this Proposition, *This is my Body*) to forge a Figure in this Term, Bread, and not one, but four, one on the back of another, if they will have their Reasons to signify any thing. Besides that, by Bread here, they will have us to understand Flesh, Blood, and Bones by some new and uncouth Figure which I understand not.

4. The Romanists at this Day cannot endure this sort of Speech, as to hear the consecrated Wafer called Bread. Should a Priest in the Popish Countreys, who is going to sing Mass, but say, I go to break Bread, it might come to cost him his Life.

2. *Arg.* If the Bread be converted into the real Body of Christ, the Wine is also converted into the real Blood of Christ. But the Wine is not transubstantiated into his Blood: Therefore neither is the Bread transubstantiated into his Body. For the Confirmation of this Argument, this only is to be proved, That there is no Transubstantiation of the Cup, or Wine. For they grant that if both be not, neither of them is transubstantiated.

Now in order to a clearing of this, That there is no Transubstantiation of the Wine, I shall,

- I. Lay the Words of Institution together, as they are recorded by three Evangelists, and the Apostle Paul.
- II. Shew how the Papists would prove Transubstantiation from them.
- III. Shew that there is no such Transubstantiation.

I. The Words of Institution,

- Mat. 26. 28. *This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the Remission of Sins.*
- Mark 14. 24. *This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.*
- Luke 22. 20. *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.*
- 1 Cor. 11. 25. *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.*

II. From this Institution they argue for the Transubstantiation of the Cup.

1. In General on this Principle, that we must keep unto the literal Signification of the Words, and take them as they sound. Two things they say necessitate this,

- (1.) The Nature of a Sacrament. And,
- (2.) The quality of a Testament. The Eucharist is both a Sacrament, and a Testament: and nothing ought to be expressed in more plain and naked Terms than these, that all Obscurity and Ambiguity may be prevented. For if Sacramental, or Testamentary Terms be improper and figurative, then their Signification is uncertain; and consequently the Sacrament, or Testament, delivered in such Terms is vain and uncertain.

This is the Foundation that they lay; and upon this Foundation they would build Transubstantiation, from these three Terms or Expressions, in the Words of Institution, which prove that the Cup, or that which is contained in the Cup, is the true and proper Blood of Jesus Christ.

1. It is expressly called his Blood. *This is my Blood.*
 2. It is expressly called the New Testament in his Blood. But Wine cannot be the New Testament in his Blood.

3. It is expressly said to be shed for them for the Remission of Sins. Now it was not Wine, but his true and proper Blood that was shed for them for the Remission of Sins.

But the Foundation here laid, is not only precarious, weak, and sandy; but false and erroneous. For,

1. Nothing is more frequent and familiar than improper and figurative Terms in the Institution of Sacraments. This we have seen before in the Institutions of both Testaments. And were not their Brows of Bras, they could never have the Face to deny it, and to contradict themselves (as we shall see) in denying of it. But nothing is more frequent with them than this, to say, and unsay, to affirm, and deny, maintain, or disclaim any Position, as may make most for the advantage of the Cause that they defend.

2. Terms and Phrases may be improper and figurative, and yet plain and easy to be understood. A figurative, and an obscure or ambiguous Term are not all one. The Papists themselves do confess that there are several tropical Terms (as I shall shew) in the Institution of the Cup, and yet affirm, That they have the certain and true Interpretation of them: And therefore (by their own Confession) the certain Signification of figurative Phrases and Forms of Speech may be known. But in this they do not only contradict and condemn themselves, but reflect on, and accuse the God of Heaven, as delivering his Mind to Men, in matters of eternal Concernment, in terms of an ambiguous, uncertain, and unintelligible Signification.

3. Testamentary Dispositions ought to be plain, and may be so, tho there be some improper Terms in them. *Jacob's* Testament was full of Figures, *Gen. 49.* yet without doubt well understood by his Sons and their Posterity.

4. The Eucharist is not the Testament of Christ, but a Sign and Seal of his Testament. The new Testament was in being before the Institution of the Supper; and Baptism, which is a Sacrament and Seal of the New Testament, was then already instituted. And therefore the Instance of a Testator, here brought by them, is impertinent and to no purpose, viz. The Words of a Testator, wherein he says to his Legatee, *I bequeath a House to thee*, may not be interpreted, *I leave the Sign of an House to thee*; no more may the Words of Christ's Testament, viz. *This Cup is the New Testament*, be expounded, *This Cup is the Sign of the New Testament*. This, I say, is impertinent: For there is a manifest Dissimilitude in the Examples. That of the Testator is a proper Testament, this of our Saviour is but a Seal of his Testament. Now if a Testator, who hath in his Testament given a House to his Heir, should give this Testament with the Seal annexed unto it, into the hand of his Heir, saying, *This is the House which I give unto thee*; It would be evident and easy enough for any to understand, that the thing so put into his Hand, is not the House it self, but the Assurances and Confirmations of it. And it is no more difficult to understand the meaning of our Lord

in these Words, *This Cup is the New Testament*, i. e. I have in my Testament bequeathed all my Goods unto you, and this Cup is instituted to be a visible Seal of this my Testament unto you.

5. The Papiſts forſake their own Foundation, or depart from the proper Signification of the Words in ſeveral things. As,

(1.) When it is ſaid, *That he took the Cup after Supper*, Luke 22. 20. They ſay, and truly, the Cup is put for, and ſignifies the Wine in the Cup.

(2.) When it is ſaid, *That he took the Cup*, &c. ſaying, *This Cup is the New Testament*, Luke 22. 20. here they ſay, the Cup is put for, and ſignifies his Blood in the Cup.

(3.) When he ſaith of that in the Cup, *This is my Blood*, they ſay, it is meant of that which is hidden under the Form and Accidents of Wine; and reſolve this Propoſition thus, This compound of my Blood and the Accidents of Wine, is my Blood. Again,

(4.) When he calls that which he drank, *the Fruit of the Vine*, Mat. 26. 29. They ſay, That by the Fruit of the Vine, we muſt underſtand his Blood.

This is their keeping to the Letter of the Words.

6. The proper and literal Senſe of the Words of Inſtitution cannot be the true and proper Meaning of our Saviour in them; becauſe if they be ſo taken, they carry in their very Face the groſſeſt Abſurdities that can be imagined, and ſuch as make our Saviour's Words to contain and hold forth a ridiculous and monſtrous Senſe. If we take them properly, *unſonant*. Then,

(1.) *The Cup* (whether it be of Gold, Silver, Wood, Stone, &c.) is truly and properly *the Blood of Chriſt*, for he ſaith expreſſly, *This is my Blood*.

(2.) *The Blood of Chriſt is the New Testament*. Now a Testament is made up, and conſiſteth of Letters, Syllables, Words and Sentences written in Paper, or Parchment: Is the Blood of Chriſt Letters, Words, Lines, &c.? Beſides this, both *Matthew* and *Mark* call it *the Blood of the New Testament*, therefore it is not the New Testament, for how can it be both the Testament, and the Blood of the Testament?

(3.) *The Blood of Chriſt is the New Testament in the Blood of Chriſt*: As if he ſhould have ſaid, This Blood is the New Testament in my Blood. But this is not eaſy to underſtand, viz. how the Blood of Chriſt is in the Blood of Chriſt, the Blood of the Cup in the Blood of the Croſs, or the Blood of the Croſs in the Blood of the Cup, unleſs Chriſt have two kinds and ſorts of Blood.

(4.) *The New Testament is ſhed for us for the Remiſſion of Sins*.

Thus if we take the Words as they sound, they come to this Sense, viz. That, 1. The Cup, whether Gold, Silver, Wood or Stone, is *Blood*, And 2. *This Blood is the Blood of Christ*, And 3. *This Blood of Christ is the New Testament*, And 4. *This New Testament is shed for the Remission of Sins*: And so in short, a Cup that is made of Gold; &c. is at once,

1. *Blood.*
2. *The Blood of Christ.*
3. *The New Testament.*
4. *Shed for us.* And what can be more gross and absurd?

If yet we allow them a Trope here, and that by the Cup is meant that which is in the Cup, the Contents of the Cup (which is most true in our Saviour's sense) yet still the proper sense will be most absurd and dissonant: For the express Words of Christ concerning the Cup are, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood; which is shed for you*: Take these properly, and then 1. The New Testament is the Contents of the Cup. and 2. The New Testament is shed for us. And could this be? Can it be said without monstrous Absurdity, that the New Testament was shed for us? Or that it was Letters, Words, Syllables, Lines that were shed for us for the Remission of Sins?

Thus which way soever they turn them, the literal Sense is absurd, and makes our Saviour's Words ridiculous.

And this may be enough to shew the Sandiness and Unsoundness of the Foundation whereon they bottom this Doctrine. Now the Foundation being overturned, the Super-structures fall therewith of themselves. To wit, that that which is in the Cup, is real Blood, or Wine turned into the very Blood of Jesus Christ: because;

1. He calls it his Blood.
2. He calls it the New Testament in his Blood. And,
3. Saith of it, that it is shed.

I say, this Interpretation falls with the Foundation that it is built on, and needs no Answer. Yet I shall say a Word;

1. In general; that all these Forms of Speech are Sacramental Terms, and must not be taken in a literal and proper Sense, but in a Sacramental and improper Signification, whereby the Names of the things signified are given to the Signs that do signify them.

2. In particular.

(1.) When he saith of that in the Cup, *This is my Blood*, the meaning is, this is that which signifieth or representeth my Blood; the Sign of my Blood.

(2.) When he saith, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; the

A Plain Representation

the meaning is, the Wine in this Cup is the Sign and Seal of the New Testament established in my Blood shed upon the Cross; or the Sign of my Blood whereby the New Testament is confirmed.

(3.) When he saith, *it is shed*, the meaning is, it is the Sign of the shedding of my Blood. The Effusion made in the Sacrament, was a Sign or Representation of the Effusion which was to be made the next day upon the Cross.

I have now done with the Plea they make for the Transubstantiation of the Wine from the Words of the Institution.

III. We shall now come to the 3^d in a word, to shew that the Wine is not transubstantiated into the Blood of Christ.

And this may be evinced,

First, From the Absurdities, Contradictions and Blasphemies that it carrieth in it. These are too many to be enumerated here, besides those even now named, (arising out of the literal Construction of the Words) and those mentioned before, that attend the Transubstantiation of the Bread, (which come in again here.) It labours with these four great Absurdities. Grant but Transubstantiation, and then, according to their own Principles,

1. The Wine is transubstantiated into the Cup.
2. The Cup is transubstantiated into the Blood of Christ.
3. The Blood of Christ is transubstantiated into a Testament.
4. The Testament is shed for the Remission of Sins.

All these are absurd enough.

Secondly, From its plain Contrariety unto, and Inconsistency with the great End and Fruit of Christ's Death. Nothing is more plain in Scripture than these two, 1. That Christ died, or shed his Blood on the Cross to merit and obtain for us Remission of Sins; 1 Cor. 15. 3. Gal. 1. 4. Eph. 5. 2. Rom. 4. 25. Isa. 53. 10. &c. And 2. That by his Death and Blood-shed on the Cross, Remission was obtained: Colos. 1. 20. and 1. 14. Eph. 1. 7. Revel. 1. 5. But if (as Transubstantiation supposeth) the Wine in the Cup was turned into the Blood of Christ, and this Blood of Christ was shed in the Sacrament for the Remission of the Sins of the World, then the Passion, Death, and Bloodshed of Christ upon the Cross was both needless and fruitless. He attained not his End in dying, his Death profited nothing; for that which he died for, was obtained, before he died to obtain it. So that, as the Apostle said of Justification by works, Gal. 2. 21. *If Righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain*; so I may say, if Remission of Sins come by the Blood shed in the Sacrament, then Christ is dead in vain. Thus

it takes away the End and Fruit of Christ's Death, the Love of God in giving him to die for our Sins, the Love of Christ in laying down his Life for us, and makes him die in vain.

Thirdly, From the express Words of Christ: *Matt. 26. 29. Mark 14. 25. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the Fruit of the Vine, until the day that I drink it new in the Kingdom of God.* These are our Lord's own Words, after he had instituted and celebrated this Sacrament, and they put the Matter out of question, for he could not more plainly and clearly have said, that it was Wine which he had drunk, and not Blood.

3. *Arg.* If in the Eucharist the Elements be transubstantiated into the proper Body and Blood of Christ, then the Church of the *Jews* in the Old Testament did not eat the same Meat, and drink the same Drink in their Sacrament, that the Christian Church now in the New Testament eats and drinks in her Sacrament. But the Church of the *Jews* did eat the same Meat, and drink the same Drink, that the Christian Church now doth. And therefore there is no Transubstantiation.

Here are two things to be proved;

1. That if there be any such a Transubstantiation as the Papists maintain, then the Church of the *Jews* did not eat the same Meat, and drink the same Drink that Christians now do in the Sacrament.

And this is plain and evident, for (granting Transubstantiation) the Christian Church now eats the Body, and drinks the Blood of Christ, as he was born of the Virgin *Mary*. But so did not the Church of the *Jews*, nor could, for Christ was not then Incarnate, nor had either Body or Blood.

2. That the Church of the *Jews* did eat the same Meat, and drink the same Drink that the Christian Church now doth.

And this is as plain and evident from the express Words of the Apostle; *1 Cor. 10. 3, 4. And did all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and did all drink the same Spiritual Drink: For they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.* Observe,

1st. They did eat the same Meat, and drink the same Drink. That is, (1.) Not in regard of the external and visible Symbols, or Signs. For they ate *Manna*, and drank *Water*. We eat *Bread*, and drink *Wine*.

Eandem escam
& pocum non
tantum inter
se, sed & nobis-
cum habue-
runt.

Quid est eandem, nisi quia eam quam etiam nos? Eandem ergo cibum & eandem pocum, sed intelligentibus & credentibus, non intelligentibus autem *Manna* sola & *Aqua*: Credentibus autem idem qui nunc. Tunc enim Christus venturus, modo Christus venit: venturus & venit, diversa verba sunt, idem autem Christus. *Aug. Tract. 26. in Joh.*

A Plain Representation

(2.) But in regard of Signification, or *re significata*, the *Manna* and *Rock* were the same to them, that the *Bread* and *Cup* are to us, to wit, Sacramental Symbols of the same Things, differing only *signis & modo significandi*.

2. This same Meat which they did eat, and Drink which they did drink, was Spiritual Meat and Drink, *i. e.* not in Nature or Substance, but in Signification and Representation. *Oh spiritualem significationem.*

3. This same Spiritual Meat and Drink was Christ.

(1.) Not Corporally, Substantially, and Essentially.

(2.) But Symbolically. *Symbolum erat Christi*, representing and exhibiting the same Christ, and Grace of Christ to them, that the Supper doth to us.

4. They ate this same Spiritual Meat, and drank this same Spiritual Drink. That is,

(1.) All of them ate this same Meat Sacramentally, *Ore*.

(2.) Some of them (*i. e.* Believers) ate it Spiritually also, *Fide*.

Thus the Church of the *Jews* ate the same Spiritual Meat that we do. And this doth evidently prove the Popish Transubstantiation to be a meer Fiction.

4. *Arg.* If the Bread be converted into the Body of Christ; then not only wicked Men, but Dogs and Hogs, Rats and Mice may eat the real Body of Christ, and consequently (according to their Principles) have Eternal Life. That they may eat the true Body of Christ, is plain, for they may eat that that remains after the Consecration, and after this there remains nothing, but

(1.) The Accidents of the Bread; these cannot be eaten.

(2.) The Body of Christ; this therefore must be eaten by them. What say they to this?

1. None of them deny but the Consecrated Host may be eaten by any of these, or other Vermin. As is evident from the Cauteles of the Mass, wherein they do not deny these gross Absurdities, or (as they call them) Inconveniences; but appoint certain Rules to be observed about them, and go about to save them.

2. But yet they are miserably divided and confounded among themselves. Some say that the Mice, Rats, &c. do not eat the Body of Christ; others say they do: Some that the Body of Christ vanishes as soon as 'ere the Teeth of the Mouse touch the Host; some that the Substance of the Bread returns: Others, that a new Substance is created which the Mouse eats; and others, God only knows *quid mus sumat, vel quid manducet*, what the Mouse eats, and what becomes of the Body of

Christ when the Mouse eats the Host. Thus they are driven to monstrous Shifts. And as ill are they set with the Worms and Vermin that breed in the Host, when it is over-long kept, which are generated either of the Air about the Host, or the Accidents of the Bread, or of the Substance of the Bread returned, or of Matter then created, or introduced from some other Body, or they know not how. *Portentus Opinionum.*

5. If there be any Transubstantiation: Then the Body of Christ is daily created: Either,

1. Out of the Substance of the Virgin. Or,
2. Out of the Substance of the Bread. Or,
3. Out of nothing. But they will not tell us of which.

6. If the Bread be turned into the Body of Christ; then, as often as they Communicate, the Body of Christ is,

1. Turned into the Substance of their Bodies. Or,
2. Totally annihilated. Or,
3. Flies away to Heaven. Or,
4. Unknown what becomes of it. But,

(1.) Not the First, for then they should be Hypostatically united to the Divine Nature.

(2.) Nor the Second, as some of them grant.

(3.) Not the Third, for then who can tell how many Millions of Christs are this Day in Heaven.

Therefore no Body knows what becomes of it.

I have now given as plain a Representation of Transubstantiation as I could, as it is received in the Church of *Rome*, with the Sandy Foundations it is built upon; and a few (of the many) Arguments that do clearly evert and overturn it.

I shall now shut up all in a few Words. If it be asked, What need was there of this, or what use may it be of unto us? I say, this strange Monster, *Transubstantiation* fettereth before us matter;

First, Of Information; and may inform us,

1. Of the amazing Apostacy of the Church of *Rome*, and those that are devoted to her Communion. Here was once a famous and flourishing Church, a Church honoured by the Apostle with this high Testimony, that her Faith was spoken of throughout the whole World, *Rom. 1. 8. i. e.* in all the Churches through the World. And that her Obedience was

some

come abroad unto all Men, *Rom.* 16. 19. Thus she was once famous all the Christian World over, for her exemplary Faith and Obedience. Who could have thought that ever such a Monster as this should have had its Conception in, and been born of her Womb; and being born, have been owned by her, taken into her Belief, and made one of the most important Articles of her Faith? Yet alas! so it is. Oh how is the Gold become dim? How is the most fine Gold changed? How is she that was once a pure Virgin, and the chaste Spouse of Christ, become *the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth*, *Rev.* 17. 5.

2. Of the Genius and Nature of Popery, or *Rome's* Religion at this Day. It would be a tedious work to describe it, in the several Parts and Members of it. But we may know a Lion by his Paw; and so what Popery is (a Religion more after *Homer* than after the Scripture: As *Mr. Broughton*) by this one piece or part of it, or from this Monster that is maintained in it. This alone (if what is said be considered and weighed impartially) may give any Man enough of Popery. Be a sufficient Dissuasive from Popery. For if all were well to this, and nothing but Transubstantiation with its Appendices lying in the way, yet Transubstantiation alone is such a foul, mishapen, terrible, and dreadful Spectrum, Hagg, or Night-Ghost, as is sufficient to fright all that are not either stark blind, or stark mad & out of their wits already, from a thought of looking that way.

3. How sadly the Common People are misled, and what strange Absurdities and Contradictions they do ignorantly receive, and implicitly believe in the thick Darkness they are brought into, and kept in. What can be more ridiculously absurd than this Fiction? Yet through their own wonderful Ignorance, and the thin Sophistry of their Leaders, it is received without any hesitation by them as a great Mystery; and so indeed it is, but of Iniquity.

4. What strange and strong Delusions Men, and Men of Parts and Learning, may be given up unto. It is not to be denied, that many of the *Romanists* have been Men of vast Parts, and Learning; nor to be doubted but many of them ate so: Yet they (not receiving the Truth, but minding their Secular Advantages, and making Religion to serve a corrupt, carnal, worldly Interest) have been given up to such a strong Delusion, as to believe this grand Cheat, and impose it upon the Faith of others. Oh! to what a height of Delusion Men may be left, to believe a Lie; a Lie that hath scarce any Vail to cover it, a Lie that hath no Sense or Reason in it, a Lie that bears upon its Forehead monstrous Absurdities, and portentous Contradictions. Verily in this (according as was foretold *2 Thess.* 2. 11.) we have a visible and tremendous Instance of one of the greatest depths of the Judgment of God upon them. Let it warn

warn to beware, to watch and pray, that we enter not into Temptation. Some are confident enough, and think they can never so far lose themselves, as to take up the Doctrines and Practises of *Rome*: But Sirs, we have need to shake off Carnal Security, to maintain a holy Fear and watchful Care, and live in a continual dependence on God for preventing and preserving Grace and Help, in an hour of Temptation, and day of Tryal: For if once we begin to warp but a little, to leave God, his Truth and Way, and God leave us, I know no Delusions so strange and monstrous, but we may be given up to believe them, even to this that is made up of nothing but portentous Absurdities, &c.

5. How just a Cause our blessed Martyrs in the *Marian* Days were engaged in, and suffered for. Some Protestant Pens and Tongues in our Days have made unhandsome and sinister Reflections upon that noble Army of Martyrs, of whom the World was not worthy: But a Reflection upon this monstrous Fiction, that most of them went to the Stake, and sacrificed themselves in Flames in opposition to, is enough to clear their Innocency, and justify them in their Sufferings, in the Consciences of all that are not given over to a Reprobate Mind.

Secondly, Transubstantiation sets before us matter of just Admiration. And we may wonder and stand amazed,

1. At the monstrous Impudence of the first Founders of it. That ever Men bearing the Name of Christians, should arrive at such a height of Impudence, as to obtrude upon the Christian World, the Entertainment and Belief of a Tale and feigned Devise so portentous and prodigious even beyond all the Poetical Fictions of the *Pagans*. I may without any Breach of Charity pass the Censure on Transubstantiation, that *Ludovicus Vives* passed on the Golden Legend, *viz.* That it was written by a Man, *ferrei eris & plumbei cordis*, who was lost to all Shame, and whom nothing could dash out of Countenance. So I say, Transubstantiation was minted by Men to be wondered at for their Confidence and Impudence.

2. At the lamentable Simplicity and Credulity of the first Receivers and Believers of it. As it is a matter to be wondered at, that any Men could be so impudent to invent it, so it is no less wonderful that any Men should have been so very sottish and simple as to receive such a putrid Trump into their Belief. It is unimaginable how this could be possible if Men had been waking when it came upon them.

3. At the horrible Induration of the present Supporters and Maintainers of it. This is yet the greatest and most amazing Wonder of all, that now after the breaking out of the clear Light of the Gospel, and the

K

frequent

frequent exposing of this Monster by such a number of learned Men of the Reformed Churches, there should still any appear in the patronizing, defence, and supportation of it. Here is infinite Cause to wonder, and we might wonder our selves into an inextricable maze, if the Holy Ghost had not given us a Clew to lead us out, 2 *Thess.* 2. 11.

Thirdly, Transubstantiation presents unto us matter of Commiseration. Matter that calls loud on us for Bowels of Pity and Compassion towards Myriads of Souls in the Papacy.

1. That have such grievous impositions laid upon them, and have no other choice left them, but either to swallow down such Contradictions and monstrous Doctrines as this, or to be sacrificed in merciless Flames.

2. That are compassed about with such a thick Mist of Popish Darkness, that they do not in the least see or discern this and other Mysteries of Iniquity that fill the Synagogues of Antichrist. This is a most deplorable Case, and God knows, it is the Case of Multitudes at this day in the midst of the Papacy.

3. That are running such infinite hazards of their Souls and eternal Estates from one Generation to another. It is far from me to think of using that Uncharitableness towards them, which they with one Consent practise against us, *viz.* To pronounce all that are in that Communion, to be in a State of Damnation. This is a Piece of Cruelty that doth no way become Christians. There is a Distinction to be made of Persons, Times, Places and Practices. See the excellent Discourse of *Mr. Durham on Revel.* 14. *Left.* 3, about the Salvation of Papists. But this I say, they run an extreme Hazard (on many accounts) that live and dye in this Communion, tho' they do not give an explicit Assent to the complex Body of her Doctrine and Worship. Even the Adoration of a piece of Bread, (rising out of Transubstantiation) as very God, is the grossest Idolatry that can be used.

Now in all these Respects, the common Multitude are the Object of our Compassion, and the Consideration of their hard and hazardous Condition should move our Pity. Oh Christians! Pity them, and pray, pray that God would open their Eyes, reveal this great Mystery of Iniquity unto them, and bring them out of *Babylon*, where they are running such an Adventure. Pray down the Antichristian State, and pray home the poor lost Sheep into Christ's Fold, that are in the Pope's Pinfold, and Tents of Antichrist.

Fourthly, Transubstantiation brings matter of great Gratitude and Thankfulness unto all our Doors. See, when we think of this, how can

can we be enough thankful unto our God for his Goodness!

1. That we were brought forth from under the Clouds and Darkness of Popery, and in the days of the glorious breakings out of the Gospel. When *Alexander* was born, his Father *Philip* blessed the Gods, not so much that he had a Son, as that he had him in *Aristotle's* Days. But how should we bless God for bringing us forth in Gospel-Times? This is the Privilege which that eminent German Divine *Abraham Bacheler* was so affected with, that he always accounted it his great Happiness, that he was born after the Light of the Gospel break forth, and bred up under *Melancthon*. And *Cyprus* acknowledged it as a singular Mercy, that God had made him a Man, a Christian, and that he had his Education under those excellent Lights of the Church, *Luther* and *Melancthon*. Let this be thy Song, O Christian, and say with the Psalmist, *I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live, I will sing Praise unto my God, while I have my Being*, who hath brought me forth, not in days covered with the dismal Darkness of Popery, but crowned with a clear Discovery of the Gospel. Dis gratias agere debeo, non quia natus est mihi filius, sed quod tuis temporibus ipsum nasci contigit.

Psal. 104. 33.

2. That we have enjoyed a Freedom from these Popish Impositions, while other poor Protestants have had bitter and bloody Storms falling on them. If we look back to the last hundredth of Years now past, who can reckon up a thousand Part of those Sufferings that have fallen heavily upon the *French, German, Bohemian, Hungarian, Netherland, Polish* and *Irish* Protestants, for refusing to admit of, and submit to these things. Oh! Transubstantiation, and other Romish Abominations, have cost Millions of Lives, and Rivers of Blood, while we have sat in a Calm, and not once tasted of the Popish Fury and Cruelty.

3. That to this day we are delivered from this, and the many other grievous Impositions of *Rome*. O what a Complication of Mercies, have we in this one great Mercy, that after all the Contrivances and Attempts of the Papists for this hundred years, we may at this day set up our Stone, and call it *Eben-ezer*, saying, *Hitherto hath the Lord helped us*. 1 Sam. 7. 12.

Fifthly, Transubstantiation doth moreover suggest unto us matter of daily Supplication, and calls us to our Knees, to beg with Eyes, Hands and Hearts lifted up to Heaven, for Protection, Preservation and Deliverance from the return and re-entrance of the Religion of this degenerated and Apostate Church, that brings this Monster in its Womb, which, if embraced, will destroy and damn our Souls; and if rejected, will destroy and burn our Bodies to Ashes; and cost us no less than our Souls or our Lives. I find that there was in the Liturgy of *Edward* the sixth a Prayer to be delivered:

livered from the Usurpation, Tyranny, and Enormities of the Bishop of *Rome*, which was afterwards taken out, to take away (as is said) the Offence that it gave unto the Papists: but verily, how much soever it may offend them, we have much need to put it into our daily Litanies, or humble Supplications, and to pray without ceasing, that we may never fall back into that most woful, lamentable, and forlorn Estate that a Return of Popery will quickly plunge and sink us into. The Pope solemnly curseth us upon *Good-friday*; whereupon one prayed, that he may so curse us still, and never bless us more, as he blessed us in *Queen Marie's Time*. To this Prayer let all, that have any Love for their Religion, any Detestation of the worst of Errors and Idolatries, any Concernment for their Souls, any Care of their Estates, Lives, and Posterities, and would not run unspeakable Hazards for both Worlds, say,

A M E N.

FINIS.
